

The Classical Review

OCTOBER 1890.

HORATIANA.—III. KELLER'S THREE CLASSES OF MSS.¹

ALL that can be done for the text of a classical author, in the way of collating MSS. and ransacking scholiasts, grammarians and other ancient writers, has been done for Horace by Messrs. O. Keller and A. Holder. Their larger edition (1864—9), their smaller edition (1879) and the *Epilegomena* (1879—80), published by Keller, alone give an unexampled conspectus of critical material. But, though this material had never been collected so carefully or in so neat a form, the parts of it were almost all known before, and Keller and Holder do not pretend to have discovered a single new reading of any moment. What they do pretend is that they have discovered, for about 95 readings out of 100, the scientific criterion of authenticity. They say that

(1) though, as a rule, there are only two variants of any given passage of Horace, yet the MSS. fall into three Classes:

(2) these Classes derive from three ancient archetypes, the oldest of which is represented by Class III, the next by Class I, and the latest, namely the edition of Mavortius, about A.D. 520, is represented by Class II:

(3) the agreement of any two Classes is almost always conclusive against the third:

(4) as Class I almost always agrees with one of the other Classes, the readings of Class I are almost always correct, and this is therefore the best Class to follow, where all three are at variance.

Obviously it is very difficult and dangerous to dispute propositions like these, put forward more than once by each and both of two scholars who have an unparalleled knowledge of the details. But if one may not dissent from Keller and Holder's principles, one ought to accept their text, which no one is inclined to do. Later editors, so far as I have seen, escape from the dilemma by a most convenient loophole. It happens that Keller and Holder have made the mistake of unduly decriing the famous V, *Blandinus vetustissimus*, and have even insinuated that Cruquius was a forger and humbug. On this ground their judgment is very easily overridden, and the dissenters go on their way rejoicing. But, as a matter of fact, V is not of special value, as I have said before, except for the *Satires*; elsewhere, it merely confirms readings which were well supported already, so much so, that out of 250 readings ascribed to V, Keller and Holder have themselves adopted, for other reasons, 140, while Lucian Müller, who is a fervent partisan of V against them, only adopts 156.² Thus, for four-fifths of Horace, Keller and Holder's principle is as strong as ever, and ought to be rejected on its merits or not at all. It is true that they have almost rendered criticism impossible. The mass of facts which they give is perfectly appalling, but, after all, it is only half, and the less valuable half, of what they know, for they have handled

¹ I find that in *Carm.* III. 14, 11 my proposed *expectate* (supra p. 155) has been partly anticipated by Bücheler's *spectate*, and that in *Sat.* II. 3, 208 Horkel has already proposed *cerebrique*. A curious hieroglyph in my last paper was a misprint for an italic *g*.

NO. XXXVI. VOL. IV.

² Bentley took 136: Haupt, 156: Vahlen, 158. These figures are from Kukula, *De Codice Cruquii Vetustissimo* p. 69. The same writer proves that the number of readings, which can with certainty be attributed to V, is far smaller than is usually supposed.

nearly fifty MSS. Then they give their opinions *ex cathedra*, without any reasons, and it seems both an interminable and a useless undertaking to fumble for their reasons among their facts. Nevertheless, I believe a clear case can be made out against their Class I, which is, in fact, the key of their position. It seems to me that Class I is a mere figment, designed to give an appearance of science to an unscientific procedure. In fact, when Keller says he has two Classes against one, he has only six or seven MSS. against five or six, which is a different thing and, under the circumstances, a wholly unimportant thing. I will attempt to prove this point shortly, though it is difficult to keep any point clear in such a tangle.

It should be mentioned that Holder seems to have done quite as much of the actual work of collation as Keller, and most distinctly assumes half the responsibility for the theory of three Classes, but Keller has prepared most of the published work, and it is more convenient to refer to him alone as editor-in-chief.

The MSS. used in Keller's smaller edition are $A\alpha\gamma\epsilon B C\gamma D\tau R\phi\psi\lambda\delta\zeta\epsilon\pi Luv$, but certain pairs of these are alleged to be derived from the same original, so that they are ordinarily quoted as $A' (= A\alpha)\gamma\epsilon B' (= BC)gD' (= D\tau)RF (= \phi\psi)\lambda' (= \lambda)\delta' (= \delta\zeta)$

$d\epsilon\pi (= \pi L)u' (= uv)$. Of these, $D\tau$ are too fragmentary to be of much use, and most of the others are deficient in some considerable part of Horace. We should add, therefore, M , which is nearly complete and is of great importance to the theory of Classes.¹

These MSS. are assigned to the following dates, viz. B to saec. 8—9: $A\alpha\gamma D\tau R\phi\psi\lambda\delta\zeta\epsilon\pi Lu$ to saec. 10 or thereabouts: γCM to saec. 11: $E\zeta v$ to saec. 12: g is said to have been written between the years 1456 and 1467, but is collated for the *Satires* and *Epistles* owing to its affinity with the lost V, *Blandinius Vetustissimus*, which was perhaps of the ninth century. It will be seen that, on Keller's showing, there is more to be said on the score of antiquity against γME than against the others of the same date, for C is said to be copied from the same archetype as B (saec. 8—9), z goes with δ (saec. 9—10) and v with u ('saec. X. ineuntis'), whereas γME are not paired with any MSS. of greater antiquity.

Keller divides these MSS. into three Classes, the distinctive readings of which are set out in a table at the end of the *Epilegomena*, published in 1880, though the existence of the three Classes was distinctly affirmed by both Keller and Holder in 1864. The first two entries in the table will sufficiently show its character:

Class I.	Class II.	Class III.
<i>Carm.</i> I. i. 7 <i>mobiliūm</i> $aMCRv[V]$ i. 15 <i>icariis</i> $aMCRv$.	<i>mobiliūm</i> AB [V] <i>icariis</i> AB.	{ <i>nobiliūm</i> $\pi\pi u'$ <i>mobiliūm</i> $FX\delta R[V]$ <i>icareis</i> $FX\delta\pi u'$.

There are 676 such entries.

The Classes of course are determined by readings peculiar to each. Let us, therefore, first assume that there are readings enough to constitute Class I, and proceed to consider which MSS. according to Keller have these readings. (Classes II and III are not of importance to our present purpose, but it will help to keep matters clear if it be remembered that B is always of Class II, and $F(\phi\psi)$ is always of Class III.)

R, throughout the whole of Horace, varies capriciously between Classes I and III. For *Carm.* I the steady representatives of Class I are $aD' (D\tau)MCv$. In *Carm.* II a goes into Class II and joins A, but γ which was previously of Class III comes over into I. Hence in *Carm.* II the steady representatives of Class I are $D' (D\tau)M\gamma Cv$. In *Carm.* III D is deficient, leaving $\tau M\gamma Cv$ as representatives; but in the course of this

book first v , then M, then τ fail, and after xxvii. 10 C goes over into Class II and joins B. Hence in *Carm.* IV the only remaining representative of Class I is γ .² In the *Epodes* M is not deficient (v also has a few passages), so the steady representatives are $M\gamma$, but after *Epod.* xvi. 8 a leaves A and Class II and comes over to Class I again. In *Carm.* *Saec.* the authorities are $aM\gamma v$. In the *Satires*, D again and E come in, so the authorities are $aDME\gamma$, but v has left Class I and gone into Class III. In *Epp.* I D is deficient but A begins again and goes

¹ M is *Mellicensis*, at Melk near Vienna. It is collated throughout in the *Epilegomena*.

² Keller here calls in β' , the supposed archetype of three MSS. of which β (tenth century) is the chief. This MS. is not elsewhere quoted. The analysis given above is only intended to show the main fluctuations of the MSS. The exact point at which a lacuna occurs, or at which a MS. changes its Class, is of no immediate importance.

into Class I, while E goes into Class II. The authorities for Class I now are A' (Aa)My (ν though not defective is no longer classed). In *Epp.* II A is deficient, leaving aMγ only for Class I. In *A. P. v.*, which has been under a cloud, reappears in Class I, making the authorities aMγν.

Several facts are to be noticed in this list. First, A and α, though supposed to be copied from one archetype (A'), are of different Classes for many pages together: similarly B and C, though supposed to be copies of B', are in great part of different Classes. Possibly Keller is right in pairing these MSS. together, but, if he is, then the Classes can hardly be of much importance. Secondly, AaECv leave Class I entirely for a large part of their contents, and R agrees quite as often with Class III as with Class I. Thirdly, (Dr being omitted as mere fragments) the only consistent representatives of Class I are Mγ, which are considerably later MSS. than most of the rest. It would seem, then, that without My the class could not have been constituted at all, and My may well be compilations from existing MSS. Moreover, the peculiar strength of Class I, viz. that it almost always agrees with one of the other Classes, is precisely the quality which we should expect in a compilation. There is thus grave suspicion that Class I so far as it is an edition of Horace at all, is an edition of the eleventh century, and not of the fifth or sixth as Keller alleges. This suspicion is confirmed when we examine the readings which are said to be distinctive of the Class.

To constitute three Classes of MSS. there must be either three important variants or several cases of two variants, unevenly distributed. In other words, each Class must have sometimes a reading which is not found in the other two. Keller does not give any figures on the point which I am now considering,¹ but there seem to be in the *Epilegomena* only eighty-two places (or thereabouts) in which Class I does not agree with either Class II or Class III: that is to say, there are only about eighty-two places in

which Class I has a reading to itself. Out of these eighty-two places there are, I think, only seven, in which there are three substantial variants, one ascribed to each Class. These are *C. I. xii. 3* (I) *retinet*, (II) *recinet*, (III) *recinit*: 15 (I) *et*, (II) *ac*, (III) *aut*. *C. II. xi. 24* (I) *comas*, (II) *comae*, (III) *comam*: xiii. 23 (I) *descriptas*, (II) *discriptas*, (III) *discretas*. *C. III. xxiv. 4* (I) *publicum*, (II) *ponticum*, (III) *Apulicum*: xxvii. 55 (I) *defluet*, (II) *defruit*, (III) *defluat*. *Sat. I. ii. 12* (I) *Fufidius*, (II) *Futidius*, (III) *Fusidius*. In the remaining seventy-five places, there are as usual only two variants, but one of these is ascribed to Class I alone against the agreement of the other two.

In looking at these places in Keller's Table, I found that less than the full number of MSS. were cited as authorities, and on referring to the *Editio Minor* to see what had become of the missing MSS., I found that the convincing simplicity of the Table was obtained by the suppression of the conflicting evidence. As a matter of fact, these readings, alleged to be peculiar to Class I, are not peculiar to that Class, but are found in MSS. of the other Classes, and moreover, in many cases some MSS. of Class I do not agree with their Class but have readings which are alleged to be peculiar to the other Classes. For instance, to take the seven instances above given, *C. I. xii. 3 retinet* occurs in RΛπ which are Class III,² and D, which is Class I, has *recinet*: in the same ode, 15, *et* occurs in RL of Class III, while ν of Class I has *ac*. In *C. II. xi. 24, comas* is in RL of Class III. In *C. II. xiii. 23 descriptas* is in Rπν of Class III: xxiv. 4 *publicum* is in π' (πL) of Class III, while C of Class I has *Apulicum*. In *C. III. xxvii. 55* Class I is reduced to the two MSS. γγ. In *Sat. I. ii. 12 Fufidius* is not the original reading of α, and is also found in RL of Class III. It would be tedious to go through the other seventy-five cases, as I have done, but I will give the first dozen instances as a fair sample.

- C. I. iv. 16 et manes* found in RL of Class III and not in C of Class I.
vii. 23 *populna* found in R of Class III and not in νC of Class I.
xxi. 14 *in* omitted also in A of Class II and R of Class III.³
xxii. 2 *nec* (for *neque*) found also in A of Class II and R of Class III.

² Keller would not admit that R is of Class III, but at least it is not of Class I.

³ ν is wanting in the remaining examples.

¹ The table at the end of the *Epilegomena* is said to contain entries under 676 passages. Various statistics are compiled from it, but all of them leave a large balance of the 676 unaccounted for. We are told, among other things, that Class I agrees with Class II in 421 places, and with Class III in 121 places. Of these 542 places, it is right in 509 and wrong in 33. But we were told just before that in the whole of Horace Class I has 510 right readings, 100 wrong and 21 half-wrong. It would seem then that of the readings distinctive of the Class only one is right, but still this is the best class!

- xxvii. 13 *uoluntas* (for *uoluptas*) also in A of Class II, RyL of Class III, while τ of Class I has *uoluptas*.
- xxviii. 15 *mors* (for *nox*) found also in AR (λ *uar.*) and not original in C.
- xxxi. 10 *et* (for *ut*) found also in A of Class II and π of Class III.
- C. II. ii. 18 *plebis* (for *plebi*) found also in π of Class III, but γ of Class I has *plebi*.
- iii. 11 *quo* (for *quid*) also in π Lu of Class III, while Dr of Class I have *quod*.
- iv. 18 *delectam* (for *dilectam*) belongs also to R of Class III.
- v. 16 *petit* (for *petet*) found also in R, while τ of Class I has *petet*.
- xi. 10 *nec* (for *neque*) found also in R and not in Dr.

These instances, which are taken in order and not selected, are, I am sure, fair specimens of the whole.

The evidence, I think, shows conclusively the following facts. (1) In nearly 600 places of Horace, where there are two variants, Class I agrees with either Class II or Class III (usually the former). (2) In about 82 places, where Class I is alleged to have a special reading, this reading is not found in all MSS. of the Class, and is found in MSS. of another Class. (3) Except $M\gamma$, which are rather late MSS. (and indeed γ is of Class III in *Carm. I.*) no MS. belongs to Class I continuously, but only off and on. In other words, $M\gamma$ are the Class, and though $M\gamma$ may represent faithfully an edition of the fifth or sixth century, it is grossly unlikely, and Keller does not attempt to prove, that they do so. Without such proof, $M\gamma$ are useless, but the advantage of electing them into a Class, or of making three Classes in any other way, is obvious. It saves an editor from the appearance of merely counting his MSS., and it deceives the unwary into laying odds of two to one on his readings.

J. Gow.

NOTES ON LATIN POETS.

CATULLUS LXIV. 279—287.

Aduenit Chiron portans siluestria dona ;
nam quoscumque ferunt campi, quos Thessala magnis 280
montibus ora creat, quos propter fluminis undas
aura aperit flores tepidi fecunda Fauoni,
hos indistinctis plexos tulit ipse corollis,
quo permulsa domus iucundo risit odore. .
confestim Penios adest, uiridantia Tempe, 285
Tempe, quae siluae cingunt super impendentes,
Haemonisin linquens doris celebranda choreis.

BEFORE dealing with the last verse I will offer a short defence of the conjecture 'aperit' for 'perit,' v. 282, which has already seen the light in Mr. Postgate's edition. The vulgate text is 'parit,' which a later hand has written in G over the erasure of the original reading; O has the abbreviation which regularly stands for 'perit' but may according to the practice of that scribe signify 'parit' also. If the tradition is 'perit,' then 'aperit' since an *a* precedes is an easier change than 'parit'; while even if 'parit' were clearly given by the MSS. I should think it hardly suitable: it is surely 'terra' or 'flumen' that 'parit flores,' just as 'campi ferunt' and 'ora creat' in the lines above: the function of 'aura' is more

properly expressed by 'aperit.' I find this same distinction in vv. 89 sq. 'quales Eurotae progignunt flumina myrtos | aurae distinctos educit uerna colores': educit quasi obstetrix, I presume; and compare Ovid, *fast.* IV. 87 sq. 'uer aperit tunc omnia, densaque cedit | frigoris asperitas, fetaque terra patet.' 'fecunda' then will mean not 'fruitful' but 'making fruitful,' as it does in Ovid *fast.* II. 427 'fecundae uerbera dextrae' (the blows of the Luperci averting barrenness), and 'aura...fecunda Fauoni' will be exactly the 'genitabilis aura Fauoni' of Lucr. I. 11 where Munro renders 'genitabilis' by 'birth-favouring.'

In v. 287 Heinsius' 'Haemonisin' seems to me a certain correction of 'Minosim':

it is adopted by Baehrens and Postgate, and Ellis now seems well disposed towards it. There remains the corruption in 'doris.' Dorus is the name of a character in Terence, but it is not Latin for Dorian, or at any rate did not become so till hundreds of years after Catullus was dead: Baehrens is now left alone in defending 'Doris' here, and he brings no new evidence to unsettle Lachmann's decision of the question at *Lucr.* V. 85. The following conjectures have been proposed: *claris*, *doctis*, *heros*, *crebris*, *pulcris*, *hilaris*, *duris*, *floris*, *diuis*, *Chlori*, *solis*, *solitis*, *uariis*, *caris*. Statius' 'doctis' and Madvig's 'duris' come nearest to the MSS., but are inappropriate for opposite reasons: 'doctae choreae' seem too artificial for the vale of Tempe; and 'duris,' which is said to mean 'rustic' but really means 'clumsy,' is not defended but condemned by the parallel of *Ovid fast.* III. 537 where 'ducunt posito

duras cratera *choreas*' describes a picnic party of tipsy citizens. Several of the more violent conjectures are apt enough, and I do not pretend that the word I am about to offer has any advantage in sense over 'crebris' for instance or 'hilaris'; but it seems to be clearly indicated by the ductus litterarum. Our own Italic type serves very well to shew how easy a mistake it is by which *doris* is written for *acris*: both errors recur at *Ovid met.* VIII. 806 in the variant *ordine*, that is *ordie*, for *crate*. But all that 'acris' wants is the initial letter it lost through haplography in the verse 'Haemonisin linquens *s a c r i s* celebranda choreis': compare a similar scene in *Ovid met.* VIII. 580 *sqq.* 'Naidēs hae fuerant, quae cum bis quinque iuuenos | mactassent rurisque deos ad sacra uocassent, | inmemores nostri festas duxere choreas.'

HORACE *carm.* II. 3 1—4.

Aequam memento rebus in arduis
seruare mentem, non secus in bonis
ab insolenti temperatam
laetitia, moriture Delli.

To smooth away the 'scabrities' of this reading Bentley took from one or two bad MSS. the natural and regular 'non secus ac bonis,' which is accepted also by Peerlkamp and by Horace's most judicious editor Meineke. Mr. Keller objects that this 'grammatisch unmöglich ist, weil es vielmehr *atque in bonis* heissen müsste.' It is too much the practice of conservative critics to oppose emendation with assertions of this sort, assertions not meant to be false but thrown off on the spur of the moment with no care taken to ascertain if they are true. It is perfectly good Latin to supply the preposition in this way from the first member of a comparison to the second: take for instance *Ovid met.* XIV. 49 'ingreditur feruentes aestibus undas, | *in quibus ut solida*

ponit uestigia terra.' Possibly therefore *ac* is what Horace wrote, for this word is sometimes confused with *m*, as at *Lucr.* IV. 241 and VI. 10, and might so be confused with *in*. But perhaps a still easier change will suffice, the restoration of a word continually mistaken for *in*: 'non secus *ut* bonis.' The construction is rare; but Horace has *carm.* III. 25 8 *sqq.* '*non secus in iugis Edonis stupet Euhias. . . ut mihi. . . mirari libet*,' where Bentley would read *ac*, unreasonably I think, for in *Ovid met.* XV. 180 the most trustworthy MS. gives 'assiduo labuntur tempora motu | *non secus ut flumen*,' and Virgil writes *georg.* II. 277 *sqq.* '*nec setius omnis in unguem | arboribus positus secto uia limite quadret | ut saepe ingenti bello cum longa cohortis | explicuit legio*.'

OVID *ars am.* I. 517—8.

Nec male deformet rigidos tonsura capillos:
sit coma, sit tuta barba resecta manu.

The epithet 'tuta' is meaningless and no editor retains it: even the interpolators of the inferior MSS. perceived its absurdity and substituted 'docta'; then came Heinsius with the more scientific amendment 'scita' which is now the vulgate. But even thus

much change is unnecessary: nothing graver has happened than the common error *u* for *ri*, 'tuta' for 'trita.' The lexicons show that in Cicero this word means 'practised' and so 'expert,' and they supply a perfect counterpart to its employment here from

Vitr. II. 1 6 'tritiores manus ad aedificandum perficere.'

Ovid is fond of repeating his own phrases, and at *trist.* V. 7 17 *sq.* he has a couplet which stands in the editions thus :

uox fera, trux uultus, uerissima Martis
imago :
non coma, non ulla barba resecta manu.

He is describing his neighbours at Tomi. Now if one considers it attentively I think the expression 'non ulla resecta manu' will appear a trifle absurd : 'mortua non ulla lumina clausa manu' is a phrase I can understand ; but to say of a living man that his beard is trimmed 'non ulla manu' will imply, or so it seems to me, that he has lost the use of his own hands and depends on those of others. Therefore it may deserve remark that the ductus litterarum of 'ulla' and of 'trita' are practically the same. I anticipate the objection that any such adjective as 'trita' impairs the sense, inasmuch as the Tomitae of course did not trim their beards at all, neatly or otherwise ; and this is very true if we bring to the reading of the lines our modern habits of thought. But the ancients were not alive to this result of adding epithets in negative sentences : to take an example from the father of them all, when Homer says at δ 566 that in the Elysian

fields there is οὐ νιφετὸς οὔτ' ἄρ' χειμὼν πολλὸς οὔτε ποτ' ὄμβρος, he does not mean us to infer that there is χειμὼν μὲν ἀλλ' οὐ πολὺς : he means that there are no storms whatever, great or small ; only he cannot refrain from ornamenting χειμὼν with an adjective.

But I do not like to dismiss the distich without a word on the hexameter. It always struck me as strange that an unkempt savage should be called by a Roman poet the very image of Mars, a truculent deity to be sure, but a deity still and father of the founder of Rome, and I thought of a noun which seemed much better suited to the case ; but Riese's apparatus criticus made it appear that the best MS. had 'necis,' which afforded me no support but rather the contrary. Now, however, I learn from Mr. Owen's edition that the MS. which has 'necis' is a poor one, that 'Martis' has no authority but the second hand of another, and that with these exceptions all MSS. good and bad concur in reading 'mortis' and so confirm my conjecture 'trux uultus, uerissima mentis imago' : see Cic. *de or.* III. 59 221 'imago animi uultus est' and Ovid *ex Pont.* III. 4, 27, 'regum uultus, certissima pignora mentis.' At *met.* VI. 629 all MSS. give 'mortem' for 'mentem.'

A. E. HOUSMAN.

THE LATIN AORIST SUBJUNCTIVE.

A SCHOOLBOY or undergraduate, having to translate into Latin *The shock was so fierce that they fell from their horses*, dares not write as Livy wrote :—Adeo infestis animis concurrerunt ut ex equis lapsi sint, Liv. 2, 6, 9. He has been taught that Latin has no aorist subjunctive, that *fuero* can only be used as a perfect, and that *essem* has to do duty for aorist as well as imperfect.

This is taught especially with regard to result-clauses¹ : the elementary school-books

forbid *ut fuero* : Roby and Kennedy recognise the use, but seem to treat it as something exceptional, and requiring explanation. This paper is an attempt to show that *fuero* constantly occurs as an aorist (a use quite distinct from its perfect use) :—

- (1) In Dependent Questions.
- (2) In Consecutive Sentences.
- (3) In Oratio Obliqua, Relative Sentences and Miscellaneous Constructions.

1. Dependent Questions. 'I know why he came' can only be translated *scio cur uenerit* : this subjunctive is of course as much an aorist² as the infinitive in the

began to be used in Cicero's time. This statement, though probable enough, cannot be made with authority in the absence of pre-Ciceronian prose.

² Mr. Sonnenschein remarks (*C.R.* vol. 3, p. 9) that 'we find regularly *novi quid causae fuerit* (not *esset*)', and seems to imply that *fuerit* is a primary

¹ Thus Prof. Sale (*C.R.* v. 3, p. 7) states that the past tense in Latin is regularly followed by the imperfect subjunctive of result. Prof. Hale (*American Journal of Philology* v. 8, p. 50) says, 'The aorist always had the power of catching sharply the attention.' Surely that is the fault of the rule we have learnt ; after reading Livy, who normally writes the aorist, the use ceases to catch the attention in Nepos and Tacitus. Prof. Hale says that the aorist first

corresponding dependent statement—*scio eum venisse*. One instance will suffice to show the freedom of the use :—*Hannibalem elusum ut ubi dux, ubi exercitus esset, cum quo castra collata habuerit, ignoraret*, Liv. 27, 47. *Esset* and *habuerit* are co-ordinate, just as *erat* and *habuit* might be.

2. Consecutive Sentences.¹

I have noted in Cicero (excluding cases which seemed doubtful) nine instances of *ut fuerit* as an aorist, in his imitator Pliny the younger four instances, in Caesar five, in Hirtius four, in Vell. Paterculus one, in Nepos forty-one, in Livy a hundred and six, in Sallust none, in Galba one, (Cic. *Fam.* 10, 30—an instructive instance, coming, so to speak, from outside literature). I have not counted the many instances in Tacitus. This list does not include results expressed by *qui fuerit*, as in Liv. 34, 1, 1; *Caes. B.C.* 1, 21.

Here are a few examples :—

(Dionysius) *Eo facto sic doluit, nihil ut tulit gravius in vita*, Cic. *Tusc.* 5, 60.

(2) *Pestilentiae tanta vis erat ut tantum agrorum consules renuntiaverint, ut is numerus effici non potuerit*, Liv. 4, 40, 19—a strong instance, since usually, where *ut fuerit* is followed by another result-clause, Livy writes the imperfect in the second case.

(3) *Milites nostri tantum abfuerunt ut perturbarentur, ut magnas accessiones fecerint*, Hirt. *B. Al.* 15—a sensible variation on the clumsy double imperfect which is taught so decidedly after *tantum aberat*: cf. Liv. 39, 28.

Roby (§ 1507) states that *fuerim* corresponds to *fui* both perfect and aorist. Yet in § 1524 he gives the imperfect as the normal use, adding the aorist in a bracket

tense, connected with the primary *novi*. The aorist is probably preferred as being clearer than the imperfect, but would not *nescio quid faceret*? be Latin—I know not what he was doing? The sequence of tenses can no more apply to dependent questions than to dependent statements; both are practically quoted sentences.

¹ Here are some references :—

Cic. *Phil.* 1, 8; 1, 36; 10, 14; *Tusc.* 1, 100.

Caes. B.G. 1, 11; 3, 15; 5, 15; 5, 54; 7, 17.

Liv. *Bk.* 22:—5, 8; 32, 3; 37, 2; 40, 9; 42, 2; 45, 4; 56, 4; 61, 9.

Vell. *Pat.* 1, 9, 1.

Nepos *Att.* 1, 4; 2, 4; 5, 1; 6, 4; 7, 3; 9, 4; 10, 3; 12, 2.

Tac. *Ann.* 1, 80; 2, 30; 2, 55; 2, 81.

It is useless to reckon the instances of the imperfect; it will naturally occur much more often, having to express (1) limited statement of the expected result; (2) continuous, repeated or unfinished action. Even so, Nepos has *ut esset* forty-two times, *ut fuerit* forty-one times.

as sometimes used,² 'the action being regarded as a distinct historical fact, not as a continuous state or as contemporary with the action of the principal verb.'

Kennedy (§ 169, 3) marks *fuerit* as exceptional 'instead of the imperfect,' and elsewhere he closely connects this use with that of the perfect proper (§ 196). He quotes Liv. 26, 29, which 'unites both constructions and illustrates their principle':—*Sicilia et classis Marcello evenit. Quae sors velut iterum captis Syracusis, ita exanimavit Siculos, ut comploratio eorum flebilesque voces et extemplo oculos hominum converterent*,³ et postmodo sermones praeberint.

Kennedy seems to imply that the lapse of time between the two results accounts for the change of tense; which notion agrees with Roby's non-contemporary explanation. But cf. Liv. 22, 61: *Adeo omnibus notis ignominisque confectos esse ut quidam eorum mortem sibi extemplo consciverint, ceteri non foro solum omni deinde vita sed prope luce ac publico caruerint*. The non-contemporary theory would require *conscirent*.

This non-contemporary explanation seems intended to countenance an idea that *fuerit* must be picked out of its context in a manner and seized upon as conveying a fact, whereas the imperfect is more closely connected with the principal verb⁴ (Moberly on *Caes. B.G.* 3, 15). But what closer connexion can there be than that of result, whether *esset* or *fuerit* be found? Surely one need only say that this is the aorist. No one will deny that the aorist conveys a fact more distinctly, and with less regard to time, than the imperfect: it is here, as elsewhere, the tense of historical fact. But what really requires explanation is why the Latins so often, especially in Cicero's time, wrote *ut esset* where the aorist *fuerit* would seem more natural, viz. where a distinct fact is conveyed without either logical limitation or continued action.

² Roby's example *factum est ut* . . is unfortunate, since the imperfect is of course used after such phrases (except in *Nep. Mill.* 5, 1—*factum est ut voluerit*).

³ Madvig reads *converterint*, which would dispose of the distinction drawn.

⁴ Mr. J. R. King (on Cic. *Phil.* 1, 8) falls back on the 'more vivid' explanation. Elsewhere (*ibid.* 1, 36) he boldly translates the aorist as a perfect.

This exaggerated idea of distinctness leads to diversity. Mr. Moberly directly contradicts Roby's explanation of indefinite time and non-contemporary result. He says, 'The perfect lays more stress on the fact as occurring at a given time' (n. on *B.G.* 3, 15) and again, 'Caesar prefers the perfect when the consequence is instantaneous' (n. on *B.C.* 2, 44).

In the following passages the imperfect and aorist (or aorist and imperfect) follow the same consecutive *ut*, just as the tense varies in co-ordinate indicative sentences:—

Cic. *Phil.* 1, 36; *Caes. B.G.* 7, 17; *Vell. Pat.* 1, 9, 1; *Tac. Ann.* 15, 16; *Liv.* 5, 45, 5; 8, 36, 7; 22, 40, 9; 25, 6, 12; 27, 34, 4; 24, 40, 12; 34, 18, 2.

But perhaps the strongest evidence is the construction used when a result-clause contains a conditional sentence:—*ut facturus fuerit* (Roby § 1521: Kennedy § 196). It would be needless to mention this, but that school-boys are taught to write *ut facturus fuisset*.¹ Take the common form of sentence:—*They marched so fast that if they had followed the enemy straight, they would have overtaken him.* Now the Latin subjunctive is also the potential² mood: but this mood was already occupied by the result-clause. Hence some periphrasis was necessary to add potential force. The periphrasis used was *-turus fuerit*: the whole potential force lies in the participle—in a position to overtake: the auxiliary verb has only to express tense, they *were*. Thus the tense remains the same as in a result-clause: now both *essent* and *fuerint* are used in a result-clause, but since the apodosis of a conditional sentence must be a decided statement, the aorist is here more appropriate, and Livy writes:—*Adeo citato agmine ducti sunt ut, si via recta vestigia sequentes issent, haud dubie assecuturi fuerint*:—*They marched so fast that they were in a position to overtake the enemy if they had followed him straight.* Here *fuerint* is simply an aorist. *Assecuturi* (καταλαβόντες αὐν) bears the whole weight of the protasis, as the italics indicate.

Here is a similar principal sentence:—*Deditos* (= *si dediti essemus*) *cruciatibus affecturi fuerunt*, *Liv.* 21, 44. Make this sentence follow a consecutive *ut*, and you simply change *fuerunt* into *fuerint*. Cf. *ibid.* 34, 4:—*Habituerae* (ἐχνοραὶ αὐν), *si liceret*. The very common *ut potuerit* is precisely similarly. *Pot-* contains the potential force: *-uerit* is simply an aorist:—

Ventum quidem erat eo ut si hostem similem antiquis Macedonum regibus habuisset, magna clades accipi potuerit, *Liv.* 44, 4. Things had gone so far, that a great defeat

¹ This clumsy construction occurs in Livy three times in independent questions, never, I think, in Tacitus: one may perhaps compare the vulgar English redundancy—I should have liked to have seen him.

² I have ventured to write *potential* to describe the force of the apodosis (= Roby's *hypothetical*) without observing the illogical restriction of the word to cases where there is no protasis.

was possible to be received if the enemy had been an Alexander.

3. *Oratio Obliqua*, Relative Sentences with adverbial force, and Miscellaneous Constructions.

a. *Ferunt Evandrum qui multis ante tempestatibus tenuerit loca, solenne instituisse*, *Liv.* 1, 5: cf. *Cic. Off.* 2, 60; *Phil.* 12, 11. This is very common in Livy, when a short statement is, so to speak, accidentally subjoined to such phrases as *fama est*, *memorant*: the *fuit* of direct speech simply becomes *fuerit*. I believe however that in the report of a set speech Livy intends *fuerit* to preserve the tense (perfect or future) used by the speaker, with something like the force of the Greek indicative in *Oratio Obliqua*. But in Tacitus the use is more free (*Hist.* 4, 25; 5, 16; 5, 24).

(b) Similarly, where a relative sentence is thrown into the subjunctive to give some adverbial force, *fuit* becomes *fuerit*:—

Praeclare id quidem (Socrates), *qui et amico persuaserit et se ostenderit de hoc genere toto nihil laborare*, *Cic. Tusc.* 1, 103. Cf. *Cic. Off.* 3, 79; *Liv.* 39, 40, 12.

(c) Miscellaneous instances, such as one might expect, since the subjunctive has such multifarious uses:—

Potest fieri ut iratus dixerit, *Cic. De Or.* 2, 285; *Id periculum erat ne majestatem nominis Alexandri sustinere non potuerit populus Romanus*, *Liv.* 9, 18.

Cf. *Cic. Chu.* 91 (cum debuerint); *Phil.* 1, 14 (non quo potuerit).

Numerous instances might be quoted after *perinde ac, quasi*.

Fuerim then is an aorist as well as a perfect. This being so, why is it not used as freely as the aorist *fui*? Why particularly is the imperfect so often written, especially by Cicero, in a resulting fact-clause where an aorist would seem more natural?

Prof. Hale gives incidentally a sketch of the origin of this construction in the *American Journal of Philology* (vol. 8, p. 49). The following is a summary of it:—

Fleat is a 'limited independent statement'—he may be expected to weep. Put this into a result-clause, and you get:—*tam miser est ut fleat, he is wretched enough to weep.* This 'limited statement' was the source of all result-clauses, and when the Latins wanted to say—he is so wretched that he actually weeps, they did not write *ut fleat*, but borrowed the subjunctive of limited statement. Now the tense of 'limited independent statement' in past time is *fletet*—he might have been expected to weep. This form also was put into a result-clause without change:—

tam miser erat ut fletet—he was wretched enough to weep. When the Latins wanted to state a past fact in a result-clause, they did not write *ut fletat* or *ut flevit*, but kept the mood (subjunctive) of limited statement, and the tense also (imperfect).

In addition to this scientific account of the logical origin of the use, we may apply the scholastic method of explanation, to show by illustration and analogy that the use was agreeable to the character of the language.

School-boys ignorant of grammar have a universal rule for writing Latin prose:—‘when in doubt, write the imperfect subjunctive.’ This rule is no doubt based on general observation: the Latins have a curious predilection for that tense. We find *esset* very often (especially in Cicero) where *sit* would seem more natural:—

(1) In final sentences subjoined to a perfect—Cicero’s usual practice (Kennedy § 196)—to be logically explained by an ellipse.

(2) In consecutive sentences:—*Nos ita a majoribus instituti sumus ut omnia consilia ad virtutem referremus* Cic. *Phil.* x. 20 (cf. Prof. Sale in *C. R.* v. 3 p. 7). The imperfect seems to have here something of a modal rather than a temporal force: it is more ‘limited’ in nature than the present.

(3) In dependent questions:—*nimum diu teximus quid sentiremus*, Cic. *Phil.* 3, 36.

(4) In decrees or votes:—*Senatus consultum his verbis perscribendum censeo...ei statum auratam in rostris aut quo alio loco in foro vellet ex hujus ordinis sententia statui placere*, Cic. *Phil.* 5, 41. Cf. *Ibid.* 9, 17; *Plin. Epp.* 8, 6, 13.

Similarly we often find in Tacitus *esset* after *donec* where one would rather expect *fuit*, that is to say, where the clause certainly contains a past fact (*Ann.* 11, 22; *Hist.* 3, 78). This is exactly analogous to *ut esset*: the construction has not shaken off the logical refinement which hangs about its origin:—

He waited until the thing ^{should} did } happen.

This preference for *esset* over *sit* and *fuit* prepares us for the use of the imperfect in result-clauses. Further reasons for that use may be added:—

(1) *Fuerim* is also a perfect: in the passive especially the use of *ut factus sit* as an aorist is very harsh. *Fuerim* is also constantly used in *Oratio Obliqua* for *fuissem*, in order to give more nearly the speaker’s words. The more frequent the use of the tense as an aorist, the less forcible this use in reported speech.

(2) *Fuerim* is practically identical in form with the future perfect indicative, and very nearly touches that tense in some uses (*Tac. Hist.* 2, 47).

Yet in spite of these draw-backs, *fuerim* is used as an aorist:

(1) in dependent questions—everywhere;

(2) in result-clauses, by Cicero and Caesar sparingly; by Livy, Nepos and Tacitus very frequently.

The teaching of grammar in schools ought to be simplified in every possible way; and this point seemed to me to require a full statement, since most school-masters do not teach even the limited use of the aorist admitted in the grammars. Living out of reach of a library, I have been unable to follow up the matter through the grammarians; but the Latin authors must be our real teachers.

Consecutive fact-clauses of course only occur in narrative: the doctrine of them would therefore naturally be based on the historians: yet the examples given in the grammars show that the doctrine of this, as of most other constructions, is based chiefly on Cicero. It may be doubted generally whether Cicero’s elaborate style will teach us the ordinary usages of the language better than Livy’s simpler prose: but at any rate in a construction exclusively belonging to narrative, let us follow Livy and allow the normal use of *ut fuerit* as an aorist.

FREDERICK A. KIRKPATRICK.

POSTSCRIPT.—I have suppressed much illustration to save space; but I cannot help pointing out some passages which indicate that the Latins felt the inconvenience of the subjunctive in consecutive fact-clauses. The aorist indicative twice occurs, where the verb is separated from the introductory *ut* by intervening clauses (*Cic. Off.* 3, 10, *ut...factus est*; *Liv.* 27, 49, *ut...inquit*). So also Prof. Hale quotes two instances of a hypothetical sentence remaining unchanged, one in a dependent question, the other in a result-clause (*Liv.* 2, 33, 9; *Cic. Brut.* 126). Whether this is intentional, as he thinks, or due to a convenient negligence, as seems more likely, still there is an exact analogy to the indicative.

Dependent questions very much resemble result-clauses. Both take the indicative in Greek and English, the subjunctive in Latin: hence the periphrasis required in both for a hypothetical sentence. Now Plautus and Terence freely use the indicative as well as the subjunctive in dependent questions; the less direct form has survived. This

fact, considered in connexion with the passages just indicated, suggests a question. If we possessed more pre-Ciceronian prose, might we not sometimes find the indicative in consecutive fact-clauses? I have searched

the collected pre-Ciceronian fragments in vain: perhaps some one who has more opportunities may pursue the investigation further.

F. A. K.

ON THE QUOTATIONS FROM OLD LATIN POETS IN THE ESCURIAL MS. OF NONIUS MARCELLUS (M III. 14).

THERE is a tenth century MS. of Nonius Marcellus, *Compendiosa Doctrina*, in the Library at the Escorial Palace and Monastery, near Madrid. It is not mentioned by Haenel in his account of the Library (1830), and was first brought into notice by Loewe, who visited the Escorial and other libraries in Spain some years ago in his search for writings of the Latin Fathers. Lucian Mueller in his recent edition of Nonius describes it (Vol. II. p. 305), from information received from Loewe's notes, as an eleventh century MS., containing Books I—III. only, and belonging to the same family of Nonius MSS. as the Guelferbytanus (at Wolfenbüttel).

In the Easter Vacation of this year I made a collation of the manuscript for Mr. Onions' posthumous edition of Nonius I.—III., an edition which Professor Nettleship has kindly undertaken to see through the press, and to complete by the addition of Books IV.—XX. A full account of the MS. will be given by Professor Nettleship in that edition, so I shall content myself here with a very brief description.

The volume marked M. III. 14 in the Escorial Library comes from the Ecclesia S. Petri at Ghent and consists of two manuscripts, both of them written in tenth century Caroline minuscules, on pages of the same size, and with two columns to each page. There is nothing to induce us to doubt that the two manuscripts were bound together soon after they had been written. The first contains Nonius I.—III.; the second, which has no title, Nonius IV.—XX. To make sure of the age of the writing, I had photographs taken of three pages, one from the first part, the other two from the second, and submitted them to M. Delisle, who gave his opinion without hesitation that all three belonged to the tenth century. The text of Book I. and the first part of Book II. to the point where the marginal headings cease (cf. Mueller II. p. 306) agrees

with that of the Paris MS. (7667); from there to the end of Book III. with the Florence Nonius (plut. 48.1). Book IV. shows a text like that of the Leyden copy (Voss. Lat. Fol. n. 73), and Books V.—XX. follow closely the readings of the uncorrected text of the Harleian Nonius. These books, IV.—XX., have been corrected throughout from a manuscript of another family, just as the Harleian MS. has been treated, so that E² generally agrees with H², and they contain on the margins a large number of the headings or paragraph summaries which are found in the Harleianus.

My object however in writing this paper is not to describe the Escorial MS., but to call the attention of the readers of the *Classical Review* to a curious feature of the MS. which may or may not be of significance. Books V.—XX. (of course omitting Book XVI. which does not survive in any Nonius MS.) are written in the same hand, a very neat and careful hand of the tenth century. In the Saturnian line quoted from Livius Andronicus at the beginning of Book XI. (p. 509 M.), in Mueller's edition vol. II. p. 155:

tuque mihi narrato omnia disertim

I noticed that a small interval giving room for about three letters was left between *narrato* and *omnia*, at the very place where the metrical division of the line falls, and soon afterwards (p. 510 M.), in the quotation from Varro, *Octogesis* (I quote from Mueller's edition),

postquam avida libido rapere ac caedere
coepit
seque opificio non probiter clepere

I observed the same interval left between *coepit* and *seque*.

The next instance was on the second line of the Afranius couplet on p. 514 M. *s.v.* Humanitus:

quanto facilius
ego qui ex aequo venio, adducor ferre humana
humanitus,

with the interval between *adducor* and *ferre*.

I now began to think that the Ghent scribe had preserved for us a method of writing old Latin lines which he had observed in some good archetype, and which might have been the method used by the Grammarians of the Empire. The next example however caused me some misgivings. I found the interval between *meum* and *cor* in the quotation from Turpilii, s.v. *Immortalitus* (p. 514):

satine ut *se* meum cor voluptatibus dat;

but a little further on my confidence was restored by observing a blank space between *minutim* and *per* in the lines of Lucilius (s.v. *Minutim* p. 515):

dic, quanam cogat vis ire minutim
per commissuras rimarum, noctis nigrore.

In this instance the corrector had drawn a line underneath to connect the two words, so that while E¹ had *minutim per*, E² changed it to *minutimper*.

I could no longer resist the belief that the Escorial MS. gave us an important clue for determining the metrical divisions of the lines quoted from old Latin poets, a clue which would be of great use in emending corrupt quotations, and I set myself to collect carefully each example of an interval of the kind. To my chagrin I discovered that the instances were confined to Books

VIII.—XII., and that they were far from lending any strong support to the theory I had formed, for they occurred sometimes in quotations from prose authors (e.g. on p. 508 M. from Quadrigarius: cum non possetur decerni etc. between *possetur* and *decerni*), and in poetical quotations they sometimes stood at parts of the line where no metrical division was possible, e.g. s.v. *Sapivi*, p. 508 M., between *plus* and *sapivi*. Here is a full list of the instances, excluding two where the interval was plainly due to a desire on the part of the scribe to widen out the writing for the sake of covering the whole line. VIII. p. 486 v. 6 *partuis—quod*: v. 10 *alta—fros*: 487 v. 28 *pudorem—gallum*: X. p. 504 v. 17 *tuum—collum* (corr. E²): 508 v. 15 *possetur—decerni*: v. 18 *plus—sapivi*: v. 22 *geri—poteratur*: XI. p. 509 v. 29 *narrato—omnia*: 510 v. 28 *coepit—seque*: 514 v. 18 *adducor—ferre*: v. 25 *meum—cor*: 515 v. 4 *minutim—per* (corr. E²): 516 v. 25 *certatim—dimicare*: XII. p. 521 v. 23 *vocabulis—inbut*.

Any one who judges the theory by the evidence of these instances will certainly return a verdict of 'Not Proven'; but for all that it is perhaps worth while to bring the matter before the attention of those who occupy themselves with Latin manuscripts. Possibly some of the readers of the *Classical Review* may be able to inform us whether any usage of the kind is to be found in MSS. of Macrobius, Paulus Diaconus, Isidore or any of the Latin Grammarians.

W. M. LINDSAY.

APPARATUS CRITICUS AD CICERONIS LIBROS DE NATURA DEORUM.

VETERUM codicum manu scriptorum varias lectiones ad Ciceronis *de Natura Deorum* libros plenius et accuratius collectas ut etiam absque nova textus editione publici iuris facerem auctor mihi exstitit vir de his libris vel optime meritis Jos. B. Mayor, quo intercedente huius ephemeridis editores liberalissime concesserunt, ut id ipsorum auspiciis fieret. Quod si eo modo instituissem, ut apparatus critici Baiteriani, i.e. editionis alterius Turicensis, supplementum et quasi errorum indicem exhiberem, cum mihi corrigendi officium imposuisset tædii plenum, tum utentibus molestam singulas lectiones cum illo apparatu conferendi necessitatem. Placuit igitur novam potius

et plenam lectionis varietatem proponere, quae in Baiterianae locum substitueretur. In qua re quibus subsidiis usus et quam rationem secutus sim, iam paucis praefandum est.

Omnis memoria librorum *de Natura Deorum*—sic enim etiam contra codices appellandi sunt—ducitur a corpore operum Ciceronianorum maximam partem physicorum, quod olim integros libros *de Natura Deorum*, *de Divinatione*, *Timaecum*, *de Fato*, *Topica*, *Paradoxa*, *Lucullum*, *de Legibus* continebat. Eius corporis exstabat, ni fallor in Gallia, exemplar iam minusculis litteris exaratum, quaternionibus non paucis singulisque membranis amissis mutilum, aliis

suo loco motis perturbatum: ex hoc et ii codices fluxerunt, qui quantum illius corporis restabat totum continent, et ii, qui libros *de Natura Deorum* aut solos aut cum aliis paucioribus atque selectis coniunctos exhibent. Eorum vetustissimos, qui quidem innouerunt, ut fere omnes ipse manu tractare atque excutere possem, effecit eximia liberalitas eorum qui bibliothecis Leidensi, Universitatis Monacensis, Mediceo-Laurentianae praesunt, quibus cum omnibus summas debeo gratias tum maxime Guil. du Rieu et S. G. de Vries Leidensibus, quorum hic etiam per litteras de codicum Vossianorum historia certiora me docuit.

Quos autem adhibere potui codices sunt hi:

A. Leidensis inter Vossianos Lat. in fol. 84, membranaceus, ambitu 285 x 202 millim., foliorum 120, versuum in singulis paginis plerumque 35, continens totum de quo dixi corpus Ciceronianum. Exaratus est saec. IX—X a compluribus scribis ita ut ne libri quidem *de Natura Deorum* (fol. 1—36) uni manui debeantur. Distinguendi et verborum separandorum ratio perquam inaequalis. Correcti sunt libri *de Natura Deorum* manu fere coeua vel duabus, quae tamen non facile discernantur (A²), et manu saec. XIII (A³), quae studiose radendo effecit ut non paucis locis prima manus agnoscere non posset. Ab eadem quae in primis paginis evanida erant passim atramento redintegrata sunt, qua in re secuta est manus etiam recentior (A⁴) saec. ut videtur XV. Oriundus est codex A sine dubio e Gallia, monasterio aut ecclesiae, ubi servabatur, donatus a Rodulfo quodam episcopo, cuius sedem propter nominis frequentiam definire non potui. Postea fuit Alexandri Petavii. Usi eo sunt multi Ciceronis editores; lectionum in editione Turicensi exscriptarum supplementum vulgavit H. Deiter, De Ciceronis codicibus Vossianis 84 et 86 denuo excussis. P. 1—2. Auricae 1885—86 (progr. gymn.). Descripsit W. Friedrich, *Philol. Anzeiger*, xv (1885), 515—518. Contuli Kiliae a. 1883, iterum tractavi Gottingae a. 1889.

B. Cod. Leidensis Voss. Lat. fol. 86, membranaceus, 285 x 205 mm., foliorum 192, versuum plerumque 29. Continet eandem operum collectionem quam Voss. 84, sed pluribus quam in illo transpositionibus deformatam, quae ni fallor ipsi archetypo debentur, cuius membranae aliquando magis disturbatae fuisse videntur. Scriptus est manu valida nec eleganti saeculi ut videtur X, verbis saepe coniunctis aut male separatis. Libri *de Natura Deorum* (fol. 1—10^v; 14^v—

59^v; 171^v—175^v) tractati sunt a duobus antiquis correctoribus (B¹), quorum prior, qui fortasse idem fuit codicis rubricator, raro deprehenditur, posterior sed et ipse saeculo X non inferior in codice non nimis diligenter scripto accuratissime suo munere functus est, sed saepissime, id quod dolendum est, priorem lectionem radendo funditus delevit. Recentiores manus (B³ et B⁴) hic illic quaedam correxerunt vel notulas adscripserunt. Servabatur et hic procul dubio in Gallia, ut videtur in eadem bibliotheca atque cod. A, postea certe et ipse fuit, ut docuit vir doctissimus de Vries, Alexandri Petavii. Etiam hoc codice plures usi sunt; adnotationis Turicensis supplementa edidit H. Deiter, *Rhein. Mus.* N. F. 37 (1882), 314—317 et in programme cit. Imago invenitur apud Chatelain, *Paléogr. des class. lat.* tab. 39. Contuli Kiliae a. 1884, iterum inspexi Gottingae a. 1889.

C. Cod. Leidensis, Bibl. publ. Lat. 118, membranaceus, 245 x 175 mm., foliorum 102, versuum plerumque 32. Continet tantum libros *de Natura Deorum* (fol. 1—40), *de Divinatione*, *de Legibus*. Scriptus est littera langobardica saec. XI, ut veri similiter conicere mihi videor, in monasterio Casinensi, ubi Desiderio abbate (1056—1085) libros *de Natura Deorum* descriptos esse tradit Leo Ostiensis (*Mon. Germ. Hist. Scr.* vii. 747). Confectus est penso inter plures scribas (C vel C¹) distributo et in libris *de Natura Deorum* correctus ab antiqua manu et eadem langobardica (C²), quae aegre a prima dignoscitur. Plura correxit C³ saec. XII—XIII. Hunc codicem, qui quod olim Nic. Heinsii fuit Heinsianus vocari solet atque etiam H littera designatur, adhibuit praeter alios Baiter in editione Turicensi, cuius lectiones supplevit H. Deiter, De Ciceronis codice Leidensi no. 118 denuo collato, Emden 1882 (progr. gymn.). Cf. Chatelain t. 38. Contuli Gottingae a. 1889.

F. Cod. Florentinus, Bibliothecae Laurentianae Marcianus 257, membranaceus, 313 x 265 mm., foliorum 90, binis columnis scriptus, versuum plerumque 37. Continet totum corpus (*Natura Deorum* fol. 1—28) saeculo X nitidissime et diligentissime exaratum et distinctum, prima pagina splendidissime coloribus et litteris maiusculis exornata. Correctus est a compluribus manibus, quae non ubique satis certe discernuntur. Fuit olim ecclesiae cathedralis Argentinenensis, cui dederat Werinarius episcopus (1001—29), saec. XV a Poggio Florentiam translatus est. Tractavit eum iam cardinalis Lagomarsinus qui num. 11

designavit. Cf. Reifferscheid, *Rhein. Mus.* N. F. 17 (1862), 295; H. Ebeling, *Philol.* 43 (1884), 705-7; Chatelain t. 37. Intercedente illustrissimo viro, qui Borussiae rebus ecclesiasticis et scholasticis praeest, Kiliam benigne transmissum contuli a. 1885—86.

M. Cod. Bibliothecae Universitatis Monacensis num. 528, membran., 248 x 185 mm., fol. 153, binis columnis scriptus, vers. fere 32. Continet eosdem libros quos ABF praeter *Topica*, scriptos saec. XI a duobus vel tribus scriptoribus, emendatus paulo post ut videtur ab uno correctore (M²) qui etiam singulis paginis librorum titulos superscripsit. Inter posteriores correctiones, quae hic illic deprehenduntur, Iohannis Aventini manus agnoscitur. Fuit enim codex monasterii Biburgensis (Bavariae inferioris), a quo Aventino commodatus est, postea Collegii Societatis Jesu Ingolstadiensis. Adhibuit eum, littera H designatum, Moserus in editione librorum *de Natura Deorum* (1818). Contuli Kiliae a. 1883.

P. Cod. Bibliothecae Vaticanae, inter Palatinos num. 1519, membran., 300 x 200 mm., fol. 88, vers. 26, continens olim integros Ciceronis libros *de Natura Deorum* et *de Divinatione* cum Walahfridi carmine *de Cultura Hortorum*, sed nunc quaternionibus singulisque foliis amissis ex libris *de Natura Deorum* (fol. 1—40), restant I. 27—75; II. 16—59, 63—68, 111—156, 162—168; III. 6 sqq. De aetate codicis quamquam varie viri docti iudicaverunt, recte tribui videtur saec. XI. Rubricatorem nunquam expertus est; quae correcta sunt fere omnia primo cuique scriptori—nam plures videntur collaborasse—debentur, in paucissimis altera manus agnoscitur. Usus eo est iam Petrus Pithoeus, descripsit H. Ebeling, *Philol.* 43 (1884), 702-5. Cf. Chatelain t. 40. Singulos locos non paucos meum in usum inspexerunt benigneque mecum communicaverunt H. Ebeling, E. Stroebel, plurimos O. Guenther, qui etiam totum librum II accuratissime contulit. Quibus omnibus huius erga me benevolentiae maximas debeo gratias.

V. Cod. Vindobonensis Bibliothecae Caesareae Palatinae n. 189, membran., 238 x 205 mm., foliorum 128 binis columnis scriptorum, vers. 24. Continebat olim totum corpus Ciceronianum praeter *Topica*, sed primis et extremis quaternionibus perditis libri *de Legibus* nunc prorsus desunt, librorum *de Natura Deorum* (fol. 1—40), supersunt II. 16—86, 92—168 et lib. III. Exaratus est una manu littera minuta saec. X vel IX—X; correctiones plurimas ex-

pertus est, in quibus tres potissimum manus dignoscuntur: una ipsi scriptori fere aequalis (V²), altera saec. XII (V³), tertia saec. XV (V⁴). Saeculo XV fuit codex monasterii Falcontini Antverpiensis, postea Theodori Poelmanni. In usum editionis alterius Turicensis contulit Car. Schenkl, descripsit Detlefsen, *Sitzungsberichte d. Kais. Akademie zu Wien*, Phil.-hist. Cl. 21 (1856), 110 sqq. Cf. Chatel. t. 38. Ipse contuli Vindobonae a. 1887.

Horum codicum consensum aut omnium aut eorum qui quemque locum exhibent designavi Z.

Accedunt Hadoardi presbyteri excerpta (K), quae cum e codice autographo Vaticano (Reg. 1762) ab Henr. Narduccio transcripto in *Philologi* Suppl. Tom. v. 397 sqq. ederem, auctore Narduccio et Duemmlero (*N. Archiv d. Gesellsch. f. aeltere deutsche Geschichtskunde* iv. 1879, p. 531) attribui saeculo IX, sed iam ab Ott. Guenther, qui codicem rogatu meo denuo inspexit, doceor scripturam a saeculo X non alienam esse. Hadoardo praesto fuit corporis saepius memorati exemplar codicis F simillimum, nisi ipse fuit codex F, id quod antea propter temporum rationem fieri potuisse negaram. Horum excerptorum consensum, exceptis tamen rebus orthographicis, cum Z aut cum singulis codicibus addidi, dissensum ut nullius plerumque momenti notare supersedi.

Quae inter hos codices ratio intercedat cum iudicandi materies in sequentibus praebeatur, paucis tantum tangam. Atque illud quidem, quod collationibus meis firmatur, iam ab aliis qui de hac re egerunt¹ cognitum, alteram codicum classem esse ACPV, ex altera parte stare B. Huic cognatos deprehendere olim mihi visus eram FK, quibus cum B comparatis ad secundae classis archetypum ascendi posset. Sed iterum inspecto codice B, quem antea tempore inferiorem esse Marciano (F) iudicaram—in qua re adsentientem habui Emilius Chatelain—, vix ulla dubitatio mihi relinquitur, quin contra in libris *de Nat. Deor.* et *de Divinatione* Marcianus ex ipso Vossiano B descriptus sit (cf. maxime ad I. 12, 13), sicut altera eius pars (*Timaeus*, *de Fato* cett.) ex Vossiano A fluxit. Quin etiam, ut apographum quam emendatissimum conficeretur, unus corrector priorem partem codicis B et posteriorem codicis A videtur tractavisse. Quae cum ita sint, inutile omnino videri possit codicis Marciani lectiones afferre.

¹ C. F. W. Mueller, *Jahrbuecher f. Philol.* 89 (1864), 127 sqq.; J. Forchhammer, *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Filologi* N. R. 5, 23 sqq.; J. B. Mayor in librorum *de Nat. Deor.* editionis vol. iii. p. xxvii. sqq.

Sed tamen eas omittere nolui, ut et textus historia ultra deduceretur et facultas praeberetur aliorum codicum qui posthac excutientur progeniem et usum recte iudicandi. Velut codice F ignorato cognosci non potest Monacensis (M) natura, qui cum illo ita cohaeret ut tamen ex altera classe, fortasse ex ipso A vel quodam eius apographo, multas lectiones receperit. Sit igitur hic mixti generis exemplum, cuius inter Baiterianos est Erlangensis 38 saec. XV.

Iam si ad textum constituendum minus valent FMK atque per se stat codicis B auctoritas, alia quaestio non levis oritur, quae-nam sit correctoris B² vis et natura. Qui tam multa recte emendavit, ut ex puriore fonte hausisse videretur, nisi totidem pravae correctiones ei deberentur audacem coniecturam aperte prae se ferentes. Itaque in illis potissimum codice A eum usum esse crediderim, qui ei in eadem bibliotheca praesto erat, idque non sine iudicio atque doctrina. Velut *N.D.* I. 114 ex B¹ non *ueretur deus ne intereat* et A non *ueretur iste deus beatus* effecit quod Ciceronem scripsisse Augustinus testatur (*Epist.* 118, 30. T. 2, p. 446 Migne; sed omisso v. *beatus*): non *ueretur iste deus beatus ne intereat*. Quamquam paulo ante cum B¹ recte scripsisset *habet*, sed omisso *enim*, ex cod. A, qui una syllaba iterata praebebat *habet enim*, falso correxit *habet enim*. In aliis prorsus suo ingenio indulsit. Has igitur correctiones, quae a prima manu non satis discretas in interpolationis suspicionem codicem B adduxerunt, si detraxeris, non ita plura in eo aut graviora consulto mutata invenies, quam in A, qui prioris classis sine dubio principatum tenet, cum eius gemellus V saepius iam doctam vel certe consideratam emendationem passus sit, plurima eiusdem exempla praebeant C et P. Ceterum ex V, sed iam correcto, fluxit codex Oxoniensis Collegii Mertoniani saec. XII, ut demonstravit J. B. Mayor, qui integram eius collationem in editione proposuit, et ut videtur etiam Wolfenbottelanus inter Gudianos 2 saec. XIV. Cum C arte congruit Burnei-anus 148, quo et ipso usus est Mayor, saec. XIII.

Sed haec quasi in transitu. In ipsis autem lectionibus proponendis id secutus sum, ut non solum archetypus codicesque deperditi propius ad eum accedentes, quibus omnis textus fides nititur, quasi instaurari, sed etiam singulorum codicum indoles et cum aliis quos non adhibui cognatio recte iudicari posset, simul autem farragine lectionum usus ne impediretur. Omisi igitur, nisi quae causa maior obstat, ea

quae etsi per se scitu non indigna tamen fortuito magis scribarum arbitrio debentur, scilicet

1. scribendi compendia, etiam *r. p. = res publica*, similia—quae notanda erant plenis litteris omnia transcripsi—;

2. verba prave coniuncta aut separata;

3. distinguendi rationem et litterarum maiuscularum usum (itaque quae afferenda erant, omnia litteris minusculis reddidi);

4. correctiones ad has solas res pertinentes;

5. quae a primo scriptore inter scribendum correctae sunt, verba item ab eodem supra versum addita (qua de causa quaedam videbuntur praetermissa, quippe ab aliis et maxime Deitero posterioribus manibus falso adscripta);

6. posteriorum quoque correctorum delendi mutandi addendi rationem, quam recentes quidam editores frustra typis exprimere conati sunt. Equidem et commodius et planius puto distincte dicere quid prima quid secunda manus legi voluerit.

7. recentiores notulas in margine appictas, similia;

8. res quasdam orthographicas, de quibus posthac summam dicendum erit.

Ne porro duplicaretur lectionum numerus, non fere notavi codicum cum editione Baiteriana (M. Tullii Ciceronis Opera ex rec. I. C. Orellii. Ed. altera, vol. iv. Turici 1861, p. 370 sqq.) consensum. Is igitur e collationis silentio concludendus erit, ut ex. gr., si I. 1, 5 ponitur *sint AB¹C¹*, simul significetur *sunt B²C²FM*, et 4, 20 *ei ipsi B²F*, intellegatur *ea ipsa* habere *AB¹CM*; item si prima manus quid omisisse dicatur, ab alia, plerumque a secunda, idem additum esse. Correctorem a solito (*A²B²* etc.) diversum cum editione consentientem saepe definite notavi (corr. *A³* etc.), sed non semper. Omnino distinguendis manibus quam maximam operam dedi, quod ubi non satis prospere cederet, dubitationem professus sum aut simplici verbo 'corr.' 'super-scr.' aut interrogandi signo addito 'corr. 1?' aut 'corr. 2-3' etc. Nihil de prima manu concludi debet, si quid 'in rasura' correctum esse dicitur, id quod saepius quam vellem faciendum erat. Ceterum in hac re lectionem dubiam proferre malui, e. gr. *tractus* (*r?*), i.e. fortasse fuit *tractus*, quam liberam coniciendi licentiam relinquere, cui in plurimis rasuris propter ipsius liturae formam aut amplitudinem locus non est. Ubi ne dubiam quidem lectionem adsequi poteram, saltem numerum litterarum signorum * numero exprimere conatus sum, aut correctorem in rasura ampliore vel minore scripsisse addidi.

Ab iis, qui ante me eorundem codicum lectiones ediderunt, tacitus discessi, si aliter atque illi legeram. Omnem autem diligentiam a me adhibitam esse adfirmo, salvo videlicet errore humano. Interrogandi signa adposita non de collationis fide dubitandum esse, sed in codice obscuritatis aliquid extare significant.

Locos designavi numeris paragraphorum quae dicuntur et versuum editionis Turicensis.

Restat ut de RE ORTHOGRAPHICA aliqua addam, non ut plene de ea disseram, sed ut ea quae saepius occurrunt summam comprehendam, ne eorum multitudo apparatus critici usum impediat. In his nisi ubi de singulis lectionibus agitur non distinxi ea quae a correctoris manu sublata sunt (A¹B¹ etc.) a non correctis (AB etc.); brevitatibus causa etiam simplicia tantum verba posui, si derivatorum et cognatorum eadem est scribendi ratio velut *caelum* pro *caelum*, *caelestis*, *graeus* pro *graeus*, *graeia* etc.—Cum autem promiscue loci laudandi sint, propter codicum P et V lacunas commodum erit in brevi conspectu ponere, qui loci quibusque codicibus contineantur. Exstant igitur

I. 1—27, 28	in	ABCFM
27, 28—75, 30	„	ABCFMP
I. 75, 30—II. 16, 29	„	ABCFM
II. 16, 30—59, 24	„	ABCFMPV
59, 25—63, 33	„	ABCFMV
63, 33—68, 22	„	ABCFMPV
68, 22—86, 18	„	ABCFMV
86, 18—92, 24	„	ABCFM
92, 24—111, 21	„	ABCFMV
111, 21—156, 8	„	ABCFMPV
156, 8—162, 27	„	ABCFMV
162, 27—168	„	ABCFMPV
III. 1—6, 25	„	ABCFMV
6, 26—95	„	ABCFMPV.

Atque primum de VOCALIBUS ae et e ita variant, ut nulla omnino regula appareat praeter arbitrium vel consuetudinem scriptorum. Velut in A usque ad initium libri II multo saepius invenitur e pro ae quam postea, in sequentibus autem pluribus locis ae pro e, nisi quod etiam I. 11—20 saepe in A scripta sunt *acadaemia*, *daeus*, similia. Frequentissime autem e pro ae in terminationibus casuum ponitur (locis circiter 250) et maxime in antiquissimis ABV, in quibus saepe secunda manus correxit, raro omnibus concinentibus. Ne in mediis quidem vocabulis saepe e pro ae in omnibus simul codicibus invenitur, ut I. 41, 13 *museus*, 80, 9 *petulus* (*petus*), II. 5, 13 *chimera*, 108, 15 *merere*, III. 5, 10 *lelius*. Ad

consensum proxime accedunt *herere* cum compositis (15 locis), *ledere* (2), *meror* (2), *sepire* (5), *sphaera* vel *spera* (8). Ex reliquis notavi quae aut frequenter occurrunt aut alia de causa memorabilia sunt: *celum* saepius A (9) et C (5), raro ceteri; *cerimoniae* C, BFM et semel (III. 5, 5) Z; *ceruleus* CFM; *egyptus* (15) maxime C, ACM etc.; *estimare* I. 55, 15 AB; *eternus* (10) A fere solus; *greus* (45) maxime CFM(PV), interdum etiam A et B; *felis* I. 101, 2 ACM, III. 47, 20 BFV¹; *hec* A (8) in libro I, postea saepius P; *leuius* I. 79, 4 A²BCFM, *mestus* II. 111, 24 A¹CMV, *pene* (6) prae ceteris BF, *penitere* AFM; *pre*, *pre-* (130) lib. I potissimum BF, ABF, lib. II BF, FV, lib. III CV, FV, CFV; *que*, *quedam* etc. notavi 132 locis, 77 ex A; *querere*, *questio* (51) maxime C saepe cum A aliisque coniunctus; *sepe* (30) ACM, raro ceteri. —ae pro e in medio vocabulo Z tantum II. 11, 18 *caelare* (idem I. 74, 27 ABF), ceterum maxime regnat in A, cuius aliqua exempla iam supra attuli; addantur *varietae*, *loquaetur*, *evundaem*, similia; sed habet B quoque *poeta* (sic etiam AM), *pestilientia*, *putaes*, quae aliaque eius modi, pauciora V. Ex iis, quae compluribus codicibus communia sunt, aliqua hic enumerentur: *aesca* (4) AB, ACM, ACMPV, AMP; *aesculentus* (2) V¹ et CM; *aetiam* A (4), B (3), AB (1); *caeler* (11) M fere semper, non raro una cum veteribus A et B; contra *caeteri* (26) C, M, CM, his tantum cum A; *quaeri* (3) AB, ABM, AC; *quaerela* (2) ABV, BFM; *saepia* ABCF (II. 127, 9); *terraenus* A (3), B, AB, BF. Saepissime autem scriptum est quae pro -que, cuius 167 numeravi exempla, in solo B 89 (quae fere omnia correxit B²), in A 15, AB 13, ABCM 4, BF 7 etc. Parcius idem adhibitum in codicibus aetate inferioribus, nec non in V (ter in solo, decies cum aliis); atque eadem fere ratio intercedit inter V et alios codices in syllaba prae pro pre, quae admodum communis est in ABCFMP (*interpretari*, *praemere*, *prehendere* etc.) sive plenis litteris scripta sive per compendium. Frequentissime denique habetur ae pro e in fine vocabulorum (103), saepius tamen in ACMPV (e quibus V constanter scribit *balbae*) quam in B, raro in F.—ae pro oe maxime C, e. gr. *caepisse* (4, semel cum V), *praelium* (4); plerumque cum aliis: AB, ABV, AF, AP, *obaedire* (2); semel cum A), *paena* (6); semel cum BF.—e pro oe in iisdem fere vocabulis, ut *cepisse*, *obedire*, *pena*, sed rarius; addo *feditas* II. 127, 10 ACMPV.—e et i: *intelligere* V¹ constanter praeter III. 1, 4, 23. 26, 1 (plerumque e correxit V², sed i restituit V³); *intelligere* habet etiam A (56) libro I et II. 1—28, 87

—156 (postea tantum III. 35, c. 38, 35), interdum C (8), M (6), P (9), semel F (II. 115, 12) et B (III. 79, 35), sed in hoc corr. 1 e; *penna* MP ubique (7), ex ceteris bis BF, singulis locis A², A²V³, B²F, B²C¹FV². Formas in -es et -is, variantes non solum in accus. plur. stirpium in i exeuntium, inter collationes recepi, item verba superlativa aliaque per i vel u scripta.— i et y in verbis et nominibus graecis omnes codices promiscue adhibent, ut *dionisius*, *dyonisius*, *chrisypus* etc., quae enumerare longum est (singulis locis *philosophia* adeoque *philosophys* A; I. 93—123 constanter *epycurus* C). Ex latinis per y scribunt, maiorem partem singulis locis, *clypeus* BF, *cybus* C¹, M (2), *hyems* V² (2), *nymbus* B¹F, *pyscis* M, *pulchritudo* A, *sydera* C (2).— o et u: *adulescens* Z praeter I. 72, 12 B¹ et 79, 34 A²; *iucundus* plerique, *ioc.* interdum codices posteriores atque correctores: A²C (1), B²MV² (1), CMV² (2), sed etiam BF II. 138, 18, AB²CFMV² (B¹ deest) III. 32 14; *rutundus* (9) AB¹V¹, *rot.* B²CFMPV², A² ter tantum I. 18—24 (sed *rot.* I. 66, 24 etiam B¹, *rut.* II. 48, 31 etiam P).— uul et uol: illud lib. I et II plerumque Z, I. III (A³)CFMPV³, interdum etiam B. Singula haec notavi: *euolsus*, -sio II. 24, 31 A¹BCFV¹, III. 57, 5 A¹BV¹ (C deest); *seruolus* III. 73, 34 A¹BCV¹; *uulcanus* semel Z (I. 81, 19), *uolc.* I. 83—84 ter B, lib. III (septies) *uolc.* A (vel A¹)BV¹ praeter 54, c. *uulc.* A, 57, 7 B; *uulcus* Z quater lib. I—II, *uolg.* III. 13, 18 ABMV, 39, 8 ABV¹, 44, 26 AV; *uulnus* Z ter lib. I—II, *uoln.* III. 57, 2 A¹V¹, 91, 28 ABV¹ (B corr. 1); *uult* *uultis* I. I decies Z, *uolt*, *uoltis* 41, 13 ABC¹FP, 92, 23 B, item A (vel A¹)V¹ III. 36, 12, 66, 18 (bis), 93, 15.

DE CONSONANTIBUS. b et p: *abtus* I. 9, 40 B¹, II. 47, 27 B, 58, 22 A¹, 115, 16 B¹; *obtate* I. 36, 3 B¹; *obtinus* (-*umus*) II. 29, 5 B¹, 36, 24 BF¹, 49, 34 B, 79, 36 ABF, III. 20, 8 F¹, 50, 19 BF¹, 70, 3 AP, 80, 7 B. Contra *supter* II. 106, 1 BF; *suptilis* ubique V¹ sed II. 121, 3, 145, 19 corr. eadem manu in *subt.*; ex ceteris *supt.* quinque B (I. 60, 20, II. 1, 5, 25, 35, III. 9, 12, 61, 5; bis cum F), semel A III. 72, 24.— c et g: singula inter collationes recepi, item c et q commutatas praeter formas verbi *sequi*: *secuntur* II. 51, 20 CM, 110, 10 BCF, 124, 30 CV¹, 129, c C, III. 65, 7 ABFMPV¹, 86, 10 ABF (*sequuntur* P); *consequutus* II. 150, 30 AP.— c et t ante i cum vocali saepe permutantur: ti pro ci frequenter A (38), praesertim in verbis *iudicium* et *speties*, bis una cum M, semel cum B; ceteri codices singuli hic illic (B quinque). Quae plures simul habent, haec sunt: *adscriptitius* III. 39, 15 AB²CFM; *aduentitus* II. 26, 16

AMPV¹; *commentitius* I. 18, 9 ABFM, II. 70, 5 B²F, III. 63, 26 BCF; *conditio* II. 36, 30 ABCFM; *meratius* III. 78, 25 ABCFM; *pernitias* III. 66, 21 A²B²F; *pertinacia* III. 44, 31 ABFMP; *prouintia* III. 69, 22 B²FV.— ci pro ti in B inuenitur plus 60 locis, quorum cum tertia fere pars m. 2 correcta sit, tamen multo paucioribus simul occurrit in F (13), aliquoties etiam in M, qui idem saepe solus habet (33). Neque deest in A (17), sed raro habetur in ceteris codicibus, velut in V non nisi II. 146, 30 *condiciones* (*ciBORUM*) BCPV¹ et III. 64, 4 *suspicionis* BCFV, hoc fortasse recte. Addo codicum (praeter BF, BM, BFM) in aliis quibusdam consensum: *destancia* II. 164 9 AB; *lutacius* II. 165, 17 ABM; *propicius* I. 124, 31 ABF (priori loco, posteriore tantum BF), II. 145, 21 CF.— d et t saepissime confunduntur in vocabulis *ad* et *at*, in terminationibus -*id*, -*ud*, similibus atque id quidem in optimis et vetustissimis codicibus ABV, in quibus ipsis fere omnia eius modi a correctoribus emendata sunt. *Ad* pro *at* adnotavi locis 36, e quibus hic adferantur I. 79, 7 ABFM, 81, 21 A¹B¹, 90, 31 A¹B¹F¹, 109, 20 A¹(?)BCFM, II. 110, 9 AB¹FV¹, 114, 21 AB¹, III. 15, 33 A¹B¹PV¹, 26, 35 A¹V¹, 43, 16 A¹(?)PV, 68, 13 A¹B¹MPV¹, 74, 14 ACPV, 82, 28 A¹B¹V (post. l., prior V solus). Etiam in *adqui* (4) consentiunt AB¹ I. 73, 17. II. 16, 27, non autem in *adque*, quod in lib. I—II vicies B¹ quinque A¹ seorsus uterque habet quoque ceteri codices et lib. III omnino carent.— *id* pro -*it*, maxime *inquid* (30), A et B, raro simul aut cum alio: I. 16, 22 A¹B¹, II. 22, 8 AB¹C, 40, 25 B¹C, III. 1, 1, 5, 26, 7, 30 A¹B¹, 25, 26 AV¹, B¹ praeterea *relinquid* et *reliquid* (4, semel cum C), *tenead* (1), *ed* (1), *capud* (8, semel cum M¹); A¹ *fid* (1).— *quod* pro *quot* et *d* in mediis vocabulis pro t positam (*adhaeae*, *ostenda* etc.) in collationes recepi.— *At* pro *ad* item A (A¹) et B¹ diversis fere locis uterque (A 8, B 5); *accedunt* I. 97, 35 BFM, II. 89, 27 AB¹C, 111, 20 AV¹; *set* A (3), B (2), P²; *it* A, B (2), AB; *quit* et *aliquit* A (3), B (22), AB, BC (2); *quot* A, B (2); *aliut* A (2) et AB; *aput* A (8), B (4), C, AB (2), AC (2); *illut* A (3), B (2); *istut* B. Haec quoque in B fere ubique correxit m. 2, in A saepe.— *Haut* (*aut*) AB¹, B¹ (2), BF.— *ge-* et *gue-*: *urgere* Z I. 97, 29 et III. 76, 5, *urgure* I. 70, 29 ACP, II. 22, 8 C, 109, 26 BF.— *mn*, *mpn*: *calumpnia* M; *condempnare* M et III. 90, 21 A²MV¹; *contempnere* M, P et I. 73, 15 AM, II. 9, 21 A²M, III. 9, 17 B²FMPV, 14, 32 et 93, 13 MPV¹.— *mps*,

* Numerum 1 in sequentibus non addidi iis codicibus, qui uno tantum loco aliquod scribendi genus exhibent.

ms: *sumsi* BF (2).— *mpt*, *mt*: *emto* A; *sumturum* AC; *adsuntum* A.— *x*, *cx*: *ad-iunxit* A (2) et AB; *inficxus* B¹ (2).

DE ADSPIRATIONE: *alucinari* I. 72, 5 BC¹FMP; *arena* MPB, sed in hoc corr. 1 *har.*; *aruspex* (*aur.*) septies (BFM, BM, C, F², M, P, MP); *humor*, *humidus* bis Z, reliquis locis variant atque habent *um*. II. 18, 22 A, 26, 13 BF¹V, 15 ABF, 40, 25 ABCF¹, 43, 14 A, 59, 29 B¹, 101, 27 ABCE, 118, 7 BF, 137, 10 BF¹V¹, 145, 13 AC, III. 34, 31 A¹BF¹V, 35, 10 ABF¹V. Item variant *humerus* et *umerus*: *hum.* II. 110, 9 CMV², 159, 34 BFMV.—In aliorum quoque verborum initiis frequenter h aut omittitur aut additur, quorum quae semel tantum occurrunt, sed propter codicum consensum ab archetypo repeti posse videbantur, suis locis recepi, reliquorum hic ea collegi, quae saepius inveniuntur: *abere* B¹ (4), A¹; *aut* (= *haud*) B¹ (2), A¹B¹; *hauspicium*, *-cari* AM, ACM, C; *hora* (= *ora*) AM, BF¹, F²M, M, V¹, C¹V; *husus* B¹, C; *existimare* A (5).—In consonantium c et t adspiratione etiam plura turbata sunt, quae cum fere omnia ad verba graeca aut nomina propria pertineant (velut *cleantes*, *crisyppus*, *cocythus*, *leucothea*, *achademia*, *philagoras*, *rethor*) neque quidquam faciant ad textum emendandum aut codicum cognationem illustrandam, omisi. Ex latinis adspirata restant *chobibet* B¹, *simulachrum* M (2), *sepulchrum* BCFM et BC¹FMP; accedit *nichil*, quod C constanter habet, P ut videtur in solo libro III; item *michi* C, ubi non per compendium scribitur.—Neque scitu dignum, ubi verba graeca per ph, ubi per f scripta sint. Videtur autem in archetypo longe plurimis locis fuisse f, quam posteriores in ph correxerunt.

DE GEMINATIONE CONSONANTIUM: *appellare* A, B (6), BF, M (2), V, AC¹MP (II. 136, 20); *litterae* M semper praeter II. 93, 31, praeterea A¹ (2), C, P; *oportunos* Z (4), *opport.* I. 15, 20 B¹, II. 58, 14 APV; *quatuor* M ubique et in lib. III P (3); *repperire* B¹, M (3), V¹, *reperisse* II. 16, 24 AC M^a et B, sed in hoc eadem m. corr. *repp.*; *solers* saepius B vel B¹ (5) et BF (5), sed quinques etiam B *solers*. Alia quaedam singularia in lectionum seriem recepi.

IN CONSONANTIUM ADSIMILATIONE ubi constantior apparebat codicum usus, ea tantum notavi quae ab illo recedunt, sed addito si utile videbatur numero locorum, quibus quodque verbum in libris *de Nat. Deor.* legitur: *acc-* plerumque; *adcommode* (4), II. 139, 20 AB¹MPV¹.—*adf-* fere semper ABFP, *aff-* CV. M fluctuat, quem ut levioris auctoritatis hic omittamus; ceteri ab illa regula in his recedunt: *adferre* praeter ABF(P) etiam

C III. 42, 5 et V II. 119, 10. 159, 30; *adficere* C I. 36, 5, V II. 41, 31. III. 67, 26; *adfigere* C I. 92, 20; *adfirmare* C I. 10, 6; *afflatus* B²F II. 167, 29 (*adst.* C); *afflictus* etiam AP II. 148, 10; *affluere* (3) I. 51, 19. 114, 8 Z (sed *af.* B¹ et sic ut videtur scribendum est, ut hi duo loci rectius huc non referantur), *adfl.* I. 49, 9 ABFP.—*adg-*: *agnoscere* ubique; *adgredi* (2) ABFMP, *aggredi* C(V).—*all-* Z semper.—*adm-* ABFPV constanter praeter *amirari* I. 121, 29 A¹, *ammixtio* II. 117, 33 P; in lib. I *amm-* octies C, bis M, lib. II *amixtus*, *-tio* (3) et *aminicula* (1) C.—*adn-*: *annuere* (1) I. 113, 32 B²CM (de F nihil adnotavi); *annectere* (1) V².—*adp-*: *apparatus*, *apparere*, *appellare* Z semper (interdum *apellare*, cf. de geminatione); *appetere*, *appetitus* etc. (13) I. 104, 24. II. 81, 19 Z et reliquis locis omnibus C(V); in AB¹P multo usitatius *adpet.*, nisi quod II. 29, 35. 100, 25. 122, 7. 128, 26 A(P) cum CV consentiunt; B²F et M variant; *appellere* (1) III. 83, 7 Z (*apell.* A), contra *adpulsus* I. 24, 1 AB¹, II. 141, 17 AB¹MP; *apprehendere*, *appropinquare* CV soli.—*adr-*: *arripere* Z (5); *adridere* I. 17, 1 AB¹CM, 79, 33 et III. 1, 1 ABF; *adrogans* II. 16, 33 B¹ solus, sed III. 26, 34—35 semel ABCFM et bis ABF.—*ads-* ante vocalem ABFP (sed I. 114, 2 *asidus* etiam B²F), *ass-* CV (sed *adsequi* I. 23, 23 et II. 97, 30 etiam C), M variat.—*adsc-*: *adsciissent* (1) Z (*adsci.* A¹); *ascripticius* (1) CV.—*adsp-*: *aspergere*, *aspicere*, *aspectus* Z (II. 65, 17 corr. ex *asdpic.* P), sed *adspirare* (2) praeter II. 83, 33 *asp.* B²FV².—*adst-*: *adstringere* I. 17, 4 praeter M, II. 136, 35 praeter V, *astringere* II. 138, 17 Z.—*adt-*: *at-* quinques Z et reliquis quoque locis (10) codices plerique, sed *adtinere* A (1); *adtinere* A (3) et ACM (*ating.* B¹ et C singulis locis); *adtendere* AM (2) et AB¹M (I. 99, 10); *adtribuere* (1) ABF (III. 89, 3).—*comb-*: *conburere* (2) I. 63, 6 AM, II. 40, 24 B¹, ceteri *comb.*—*cont-*: *conlatus* II. 148, 5 praeter CV, sed *collatio* III. 70, 7 Z; *collibitum* (1) Z; *conlidere* (1) Z praeter MV; *conligare* Z I. 9, 40, sed *coll.* II. 115, 13; *colligere* (4) Z praeter II. 59, 29 C; *collocare* bis Z, sed *conloc.* II. 17, 9 ABFMP, 140, 7 ABF; *conlucere* Z II. 40, 23, sed *coll.* 99, 13 praeter M; *conlustrare* (1) Z.—*comp-* fere ubique CPV fluctuantibus ceteris. Enumerentur formae non adsimilatae: *comparrare* (10) I. 15, 17 A, 112, 20 AM, II. 148, 5 AB¹F, III. 68, 4 A nullo discrimine significationis; *compensatio* (1) Z (= ABCFM); *compilare* (1) I. 86, 33 ABFM; *conplecti* (13) I. 37, 17 ABFMP, 120, 27 AB, II. 30, 10 AB, 36, 24 B, 38, 4 A, 54, 27 B, 58, 12 ABM, 87, 3 ACM, 101, 32 B, 147, 1 ABM; *conplere* (5) II. 127,

17 AM (B¹ *contempl.* ut vid.); *conplures* (5) II. 13, 2 B; *compos* (6) II. 22, 10 B, sed ead. m. in *comp. corr.*; *compositio* (2) I. 47, 28 A, II. 146, 29 ABCM; *comprehendere* (-*prae*h., -*prend.*), -*sio* (12) plerumque ABFM, sed habent *compr.*, praeter CV, I. 94, 10 etiam F², 121, 28 FM, II. 147, 36 et 4 FP, III. 21, 20 AFMP, 64, 4 AB²FP, 67, 28 B²FP; *conprimere* (3) II. 123, 25 ABCMP, 148, 11 AB¹V, III. 68, 6 AM; *conprobare* (2) II. 7, 8 A, 19, 25 ABM.—*conr.*: *correpere* (1) M solus; *corrumpere* (1) B²CFP (II. 20, 35).—*ecf.*: *effubique* praeter II. 86, 18 (cf. ad eum locum).—*exs.* et *ex.*: *exsecrari* II. 65, 20 Z praeter A; *exsectus* (2) praeter V²; *exsilium* (2) III. 80, 13 B¹ solus; *existere* (9) Z quater et ceteris locis plerique, *existere* A (2), B¹ (1), BF (2); item *existisse* (4) plerique, *exitit.* A (1), B (1); *extare* (2) Z praeter M (1); *extinguere* (4) Z; *extructio* (1) Z praeter FM; *expectare* (3) omnes praeter M (3) (uno loco de F nihil notavi); contra *expiratio* (1) Z praeter CV².—*imb.* plerumque non adsimilatur praeter V, qui quatenus restat semper habet *imb.*; item *imbecillus* (6) C quater et *imbuiere* (2) utroque loco; *inberbis* I. 83, 35 Z, sed *imb.* III. 83, 13 ABFPV.—*intl.*: *inlacrimari* (1) Z; in aliis quoque *intl.* cum ceteris V¹: *illabi* (1) V², *illepidus* (1) V³, sed *illatus* (1) et *illuminare* (1) V; item *illustris*, *illustrare* (11) V semper (8), plerumque etiam C (9) et P (4); *intl.* 1).—*inm.*: *inmanis* I. 62, 38 AB¹MP, II. 148, 12 AMPV, sed II. 99, 17 solus A et 161, 13 M solus; *immensus* (12) plerique, sed *imm.* V semper, interdum etiam C (5), B²F (2), M (1); *inmittere* III. 15, 8 ABFMP *imm.* CV, contra 91, 28 *imm.* CMV *imm.* ABF (de P non constat); *inmoderatus* (3) P ubique et II. 64, 9 AB¹, 149, 17 AM, ceteri *inmod.* (II. 65, 25 ABCFMV); *immolare* (4) plerique praeter A¹ (1), V (2), AV (III. 88, 29); *immortalis* et *immortalis* (64) ita variant, ut usque ad II. 16 optimorum codicum auctoritate commendetur *immort.*, inde a II. 17 potius *immort.*, quod in priore parte (32) solus C semper habet, raro F (8), BF (2), B²F (3), M (1), MP (1); sed etiam in parte posteriore (32) uno tantum loco (III. 69, 24) *immort.* praebent Z, ceteris fere semper *immort.* M aut solus (6) aut coniunctus cum A (14), AB (2), AC, AP, ACP (II. 17, 3), C, P; praeterea dissidente M *immort.* scribunt singulis locis AB, ACP, AP, P; *immutare* II. 66, 3 Z itemque 67, 10 praeter M; sed *immutare* II. 19, 20 AMP et 52, 4 ABFMP; *immutabilis* II. 49, 1 AMP, 90, 4 ACM, 95, 16 AM, ceteri *immut.*.—*inp.*: *impedire* (5) bis Z, *inp.* singulis locis A, B¹, ABFMP (II. 36, 22); contra *inpellere* (3) plurimi excepto V, *inp.* etiam

C, B²CF; *inpendere* I. 45, 19 APM, II. 98, 11 ABFM; *imperare*, *imperium* etc. (6) constanter Z praeter A (2); *imperitus* (6) praeter AM (1), M (2); *inpertire* II. 27, 25 AB¹M, sed III. 75, 4 *impert.* ABFV; *inpetrare* I. 94, 7 AB¹M; *impetus* (1) Z; *impius*, *impietas* (5) constanter; *implicare* (3) plures, *impl.* B²CF (I. 51, 20; B¹ deest), CF, et V qui prioribus locis deest; *inplorare* AB¹ (I. 13, 38); *inponere* (2) praeter C (I. 54, 9) et B²CFV (II. 151, 1); *importunus* III. 81, 23 AMV (B¹ deest); *inprimere* I. 43, 32 ABFMP; *inprobus* et *improbus* pari fere sunt auctoritate: illud ABFM I. 23, 22. III. 69, 19, 78, 23, primo loco etiam C; *impr.* III. 75, 3 Z et 81, 10 praeter M, 88, 1 praeter AM; *inprudens* (2), *inpunitus* (1), *inpurus* (1) codices praeter C (V deest), semel *impudens* etiam M.—*inr.*: *inridere* (3), *inrigare* (2), *inrumpere* (1) codices praeter C et V, sed *inrumpere* (II. 144, 4) etiam V, 162, 26 *inridere* etiam C (I. 101, 33 A¹ non agnoscitur, *irr.* A³).—*occ.* semper, item *off.* praeter III. 70, 11 *obfuerunt* PV²; *obp.*: *obprimere* (1) BF; *obs.*: *opsidere* (1) B¹ (cf. etiam ad II. 107, 9. III. 38, 1); *obt.*: *obtinere* (6) I. 36, 33 Z et plerumque A(P), *optinere* II. 42, 4 Z, 61, 13 BCMV, 110, 9 CMV, 140, 8 et III. 51, 3 BFV; *optusus* BF (I. 70, 29); *optutus* II. 107, 10 ABC¹FM, III. 9, 13 BF; *optruncare* (1) A².—*subp.*: *subp.* plerique, *subpeditare* (2) A et AV (sed in V corr. 1 *supp.*); *subplicare* (1) A; *subponere* (1) AMP.—

Pertinent huc etiam pronomina et particulae cum -*que* et -*quam* compositae et similia: -*dqu.*: *quicquam* (10) constanter; *quidque*, nisi in aliud corruptum est (cf. ad III. 63, 27), codices praeter II. 81, 13 *quicque* A¹(8)B²FMV¹ (*quinque* B¹ *quaeque* A³); *quidquid* (8) multo usitatus quam *quidquid*, quod exhibent I. 55, 18 A (*quitquid*), II. 60, 37 et 65, 21 B¹V¹, III. 36, 20 AB¹V¹ (*quodquid* C); praeterea pro *quidque* I. 77, 5 *quidquid* A *quicquid* C.—*mq.*: *nangue* semel C; *quanguam*, quatenus superest, V semper praeter III. 42, 33; praeter eum C (4), B²CF (3), B²F, F²; *quenquam* ter C; *tamquam* usque ad I. 74 constanter Z (8 1), nisi quod M semel habet *tamquam*; inde a I. 94 autem C semper *tamquam* (19), semel cum V², ceteri recte; similiter *nunquam* C inde a I. 108, cum usque ad I. 107 cum ceteris scribat *nunquam*; *umquam* Z etiam usque ad II. 95 (semel antea C *unquam* pro *nunquam*), inde a II. 116 *unquam* C (6), libro III cum A (3), AB, BV, V (2), sed III. 7, 32 prava verborum coniunctio (*nihilum quam*) in C quoque m servavit.—Notandum denique, lib. I C scribere solere *menbrum* (8), quater cum A¹.

Restat ut dicamus de variantibus FORMIS PLURALIBUS V. DEUS. Atque primum quidem sicubi forma *dei*, *deis* occurrit, aut in omnibus aut in plerisque habetur codicibus: *dei* I. 3, 14, 4, 29 (*dii* C) 25, 8. 61, 25 (*A*¹ obscur., *dii* A²) 68, 9. III. 26, 32 (*A*¹ obscur., *dii* A²), 45, 4 (*di* P *dii* C) 47, 10 (*di* P) 51, 10 (*di* P *dii* M); *deis* I. 3, 13 (*dii* B²) 10 (*dii* A²). 41, 15 (*dii* A¹) 122, 16, 22. II. 79, 29. Magis in *di* et *dii*, *dis* et *dii* variant codices ita ut numquam sit in omnibus simul *di*, sed *dis* I. 14, 7. II. 2, 10, etiam 163, 1 et 4 praeter V²; contra *dii* Z I. 90, 32. 123, 19. III. 10, 19. 64, 5 (*B*¹ deest), *dii* ad consensum numquam propius accedit quam III. 70, 1 ABCFV (*dis* MP). Hoc loco et duobus proxime praecedentibus *dii*, *dii* etiam V, cuius prima manus reliquis locis constanter scripsit *di*, *dis*, altera correxit *dii*, *dii*. Illud etiam P habere solet, sed *dii* praeter locos laudatos I. 72, 10. II. 16, 30. 133, 8; *dii* 133, 11. In A regnat *dii*, quod plerumque in *di* correxit A², sed *di* etiam A¹ II. 16, 30. III. 43, 20. 49, 13. 75, 1; pariter *dii* (*dis* A²) in lib. III praeter 87, 22, cum in lib. I—II a prima

manu saepius scriptum sit *dis* (praeter 4 locos iam allatos I. 14, 7. 15, 12. 37, 12. 118, 3. II. 10, 30. 12, 27) quam *dii* (6). Cum A correcto paucis locis exceptis facit M, ut F cum B. B ipse fluctuat, sed multo frequentius habet *di*, *dis*: *dii* praeter locos memoratos I. 33, 13. 72, 10 (90, 30 *B*¹ deest) II. 16, 30. 133, 8. III. 43, 14. 17. 20. 44, 23. 75, 28; *dii* I. 121, 31. II. 10, 30. III. 43, 11. 70, 1. 4. 75, 27. 83, 4. 89, 4. 93, 15; a *dii* correxit B², ubi prima manus scripserat *ad his* aut *ab his*. C et ipse variat, sed saepius habet *dii*, *dii*: illud scilicet I. 72, 10. 90, 30. II. 62, 17. III. 43—79; *dii* I. 1—15. 118, 3. 121, 31. II. 10, 30. 45, 37. 140, 1. III. 43—93.

Ea igitur, quae hic conguessi, per se suis locis in apparatu critico non adnotata sunt, nisi quod verbum propter aliam quam lectionis ab editione discrepantiam commemorandum erat. Nam eius modi locis, ne falsa e silentio concluderentur, etiam orthographica quaeque recepi, sed uncinis plerumque inclusa.

P. SCHWENKE.

(Continuabitur).

NOTES ON TUCKER'S SUPPLICES.

499. For the use of καὶ δὴ compare Ar. Av. 1244.—

ἀρ' οἷσθ' ὅτι Ζεὺς εἰ με λυπήσει πέρα, ..
πέμψω .. πορφυρίωνας ἐς τὸν οὐρανὸν
ὄρνις ἐπ' αὐτὸν ..
πλεῖν ἑξακοσίους τὸν ἀριθμὸν; καὶ δὴ ποτε
εἰς Πορφυρίων αὐτῷ παρέσχε πράγματα.

109. ἀτας ἀπάταν μεταλγούς.

[ἀτας (i in ras.) δ' ἀπάτα. i μεταγνούς M.]

This seems to me an excellent emendation, cf. Pers. 94—100. I can testify that before alteration M had μεταγνούς. The editor (p. xxxi.) expressly derives the mistake through uncials, but it would arise quite as easily from minuscules.

718. τοῖσιν οὐ φίλῃ had occurred to the editor (as to me) independently of Herwerden. Wecklein represents M as giving τῶσ' ἄν, but the erasure is of an apostrophe (G. has τῶσ' ἄν); certainly not of a letter. I think the reading ought to be accepted.

732. θάρσει χρόνῳ τοι κυρίῳ τ' ἐν ἡμέρᾳ
θεοὺς ἀτίζων τις βροτῶν δώσει δίκην.

Prof. Tucker states that τις 'is objection-

able in a place metrically emphasised,' and writes τίς ποτ' οὐ. . . So at

760. ἀλλ' ἔστι φήμη τοὺς λύκους κρείσσους
κυνῶν
εἶναι.

he says, 'to substitute τις [Burgess] in arsis next the caesura, is to make matters worse.' Now not only are μὲν and γὰρ constantly so placed, but τις and other enclitics are admitted; as

Pers. 348. ἀλλ' ὧδε δαίμων τις κατέφθειρε
στράτον.

Ag. 1123. εἶναι κακῷ δέ τῳ προσεικάω τάδε.

Soph. Phil. 741. συγγλός; ἐν κακῷ δέ τῳ φαίνει
κυρῶν.

" " 824. μέλαινα δ' ἄκρον τις παρέρ-
ρωγεν ποδός.

" Aj. 829. καὶ μὴ πρὸς ἐχθρῶν του κατοπ-
τευθεὶς πάρος.

Eur. Alc. 181. ὀνήσκω· σὲ δ' ἄλλῃ τις γυνή
κεκτήσεται.

" El. 892. Αἰγισθον' ὥς δέ τῳ σάφ' εἰδέναι
τάδε.

Theb. 689. θεοὺς μὲν ἤδη πως παρημελήμεθα.

Eum. 462. ἐς οἶκον, ἀλλὰ νιν κελαινόφρων ἐμῇ.

Soph. *Phil.* 446. ἔμελλ' ἐπεὶ οὐδὲν πω κακὸν γ' ἀπώλετο.

„ O.C. 972. ὅς οὔτε βλάστας πω γενεθλῖνος πατρός.

„ „ 896. ΘΗ. πῶς εἶπας; ΟΙ. οἶά περ πέπονθ' ἀκήκοας.

Aesch. *Supp.* 399. πρᾶσσομ' ἂν, οὐδέ περ κρατῶν, μὴ καὶ ποτε.

In lyrics it does not seem to occur to the editor that there is any condition but strophic correspondence to consider. Dealing with the commonest rhythm in Aeschylus, syncopated trochaic, at 697 he gives *αἰδίασι τιμαῖς*, altering 704 *θεοὺς δ' οἱ γὰρ ἔχουσιν αἰεῖ* [— — — — —] to *θεοὺς δ' οἱ γαῖαν ἔχουσιν αἰεῖ*, which is impossible. Equally impossible in the same rhythm is 594 *τέκτων τὸ πᾶν μάκαρ οὔριε Ζεῦ* [μῆχαρ οὔριος Zeus M.] = 599, *σπένδοι τι τῶν λόχος φέρει φρήν* [δοῦλιος M. βούλιος Aurat.].

At 135 he writes—

ἀχείματόν μ' ἔπεμπε σὺν πνοαῖσιν
οὐδὲ μέφομαι τελευτὰς δ' ἐν χέρσῳ νῦν—
spontaneorum stabilitum, ut opinor, amore captus; and in a passage plainly dactylic presents us with this strange cacophony:

53. *τά τε νῦν ἀποδείξω*
πιστὰ τεκμήρι', ἄλλα τ' αὖ τάχ' ὁμοῖ',
ἄελπτά περ ὄντα φανέται.

[*πιστὰ τεκμήρια τά τ' ἀνόμοια* | οἶδ' M *τά τ'*
in ras.] I would read *τοῖσιν ὁμοία δ' οὐ τοῖς*
πανόμοια δ'.

875. *ἴζε καὶ πικρότερον οἷζός νομον.*

ἴζε καὶ βόα πικρότερ' ἀχέων οἷζός νομοῖ I have M. Idem accipio quod Emperius. Ratio corruptionis mihi haec videtur. *βόα* glossema est ad *ἴζε*, ἀχέων ad οἷζός.

It is not the first time *ἄχος* has been supposed a gloss; but I have never met with it so used—or with *ἄχη* written to a word in the singular. Cf. Apollon. *ἄχος*: *λύπη ἀφωνίαν ἔχουσα* and *ἀκαχίξω*: *ἐν ἄχει γίνου*.. *ἄχος γὰρ ἡ λύπη*. Schol. Hom. B 171 *ἄχος ἡ ἀφωνος ἀνία*. Suid. *ἄχος*: *λύπη σιωπῇ ἐπιφέρονσα*. Schol. Ap. Rhod. I. 262 *ἄχος δὲ ἐστὶ σύγχυστις ψυχῆς, λύπη ἐπιτεταμένη*. σαφές δὲ ἐκ τοῦ λέγειν

τὸν ποιητὴν 'ἡ δ' ἄχει οὐ παιδὸς ἀπέφθιτο' (Hom. ο 358). For οἷζός Hesychius gives *πρωχία, κακοπάθεια, τάλαιπωρία, κακουχία*: Eustathius ἡ ἀξία θρήνων κακοπάθεια.

106. καὶ διάνοιαν ἀλεᾶν

[*μενόλιν* M. in text, *μαινόλιν* in schol.].

διάνοιαν μαινόλιν is against the metre, although editors for the most part ignore the fact... *διάνοια* and *μαινόλις* are both used in connexions like this [*Theb.* 831, Eur. *Or.* 813]. A gloss presupposes a rarer word to be explained and *ἀλεᾶν* (*ἡλεᾶν*) is such a word.

However rare the word to be explained, it may safely be said that *μαινόλις* would never be used to explain it. The metre used to trouble me, till I found the indifferent syllable also at

Eur. *Alc.* 216. καὶ μέλανα στολμὸν πέπλων
= 229. καὶ πλέον ἢ βρόχῳ δέρον.

74. *ποιμαίνονσα φόβους*

[*δαιμαίνονσα φόλους* M. *φίλους* manus recentior].

The ο preserved in M can scarcely be accidental. In minuscules β and λλ are practically indistinguishable, the single λ for β is no improbable error. The reading given above supposes *δαιμαίνονσα* to have been a gloss on *ποιμαίνονσα φόβους* and then to have taken the place of the participle.

The poetical *δαιμαίνω* might be written to a phrase containing *δεῖμα*, not otherwise. It is itself regularly explained (as in the lexicons) by *φοβοῦμαι*; and *φόλους* may have been caused by *φοβουμένη* superscript, as *τύφω* in *Cho.* 85 M. doubtless by confusion of *τύμβω* with *τάφω*.

914. *κάρβανος δ' ὦν Ἑλλῆσιν ἐγγλείς μέγα.*

So M. *κάρβανος ὦν δ'* Porson rightly. In MSS. *δέ* is constantly transferred from the unusual position to the usual: e.g. *Eum.* 617 *μάντις δ' ὦν οὐ ψεύσομαι* M. *ὦν δ'* Canter. But Prof. Tucker says:

κάρβανος δ' of MSS. can scarcely be accounted for, unless we assume that the particle was misplaced after the -s of *κάρβανος* instead of after another -s.

Therefore he reads *κάρβανος ὥς δ'*.

WALTER HEADLAM.

ON SOME PASSAGES IN PLATO'S REPUBLIC.

VII. 516 D.—*ἡ τὸ τοῦ Ὀμήρου ἂν πεπονθέναι καὶ σφόδρα βούλεσθαι ἐπαυροῦν ἰόντα θηγεμένον ἄλλω ἀνδρὶ παρ' ἀκλήρῳ καὶ ὁτιοῦν ἂν πεπονθέναι μᾶλλον ἢ ἐκείνῳ τε δοξάζειν καὶ ἐκείνως ξῆν*; The first *πεπονθέναι* should be omitted: other-

wise τὸ τοῦ Ὀμήρου must mean 'what Homer has experienced,' whereas it was Achilles, not Homer, whose experience this was. The word was doubtless inserted by a scribe who failed to see that τὸ τοῦ Ὀμήρου ('in the

words of Homer' cf. *Theat.* 183 E) is the accusative in apposition to the quotation.

532 B.—In this very difficult passage we should, perhaps read instead of πρὸς δὲ τὰ ἐν ἴδασι φαντάσματα θεία the words πρὸς δὲ τὰ ἐν ἴδασι φαντάσματα < καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὅσα πυκνά τε καὶ > λεία. There is a reference to VI. 510 A, where we read τὰ ἐν τοῖς ἴδασι φαντάσματα καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὅσα πυκνά τε καὶ λεία καὶ φανὰ ξυνέστηκε. Stallbaum rejects θεία, while Madvig emends to ἐν ἴδασι φαντάσματα ἀεία καὶ κ.τ.λ. In the earlier part of the sentence Naegelsbach's εἴ' ἀδυναμία for ἐπ' ἀδυναμία of the Paris MS. is probably right.

533 C.—ἡ διαλεκτικὴ μέθοδος μόνῃ ταύτῃ πορεύεται, τὰς ὑποθέσεις ἀναιροῦσα ἐπ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἀρχὴν κ.τ.λ. If the text is right, ἀναιροῦσα is not to be connected with ἐπ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἀρχήν, as Stallbaum thinks, but means 'getting rid of,' 'annulling,' and ἐπ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἀρχήν is exegetical of ταύτῃ. ἀναιρεῖν in the sense of ἀναφέρειν or ἀνάγειν apparently does not occur. Perhaps however we should emend to τὰς ὑποθέσεις ἀναιροῦσα ἐπ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἀρχήν, i.e. climbing the ὑποθέσεις to the self-existent ἀρχή. Compare VI. 511 B τὰς ὑποθέσεις ποιούμενος οὐκ ἀρχάς ἀλλὰ τῷ ὄντι ὑποθέσεις, ὅλον ἐπιβάσεις τε καὶ ὁρμάς, ἵνα μέχρι τοῦ ἀνυποθέτου ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ παντός ἀρχὴν ἴω κ.τ.λ.; and *Symp.* 211 B ὅταν δὴ τις ἀπὸ τῶνδε διὰ τὸ ὁρθῶς παιδευαστεῖν ἐπιβῇ ἐν ἐκείνῳ τὸ καλὸν ἀρχήται καθορᾶν κ.τ.λ.

VIII. 543 B.—ἀλλὰ μνημονεύω, ἔφη, ὅτι γε οὐδὲν οὐδένα φόμεθα δεῖν κεκτησθαι ὅν νῦν οἱ ἄλλοι. ἄλλοι seems to be wrong: 'the rest' implies the existence now of some other than the rest, who resemble Plato's guardians in having no private property. But nothing is said of these others in the whole passage. Read ἀνθρώποι for ἄλλοι. Cobet (*Variae Lectiones*, p. 432) remarks 'solent

ΑΛΛΟΥΤΕ et ΑΝΟΥΤΕ inter se permutari.'

VIII. 547 B.—στάσεως, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, γενομένης, εἰδέτην ἄρα ἑκατέρω τῷ γένει, τὸ μὲν σιδηροῦν καὶ χαλκοῦν ἐπὶ χρηματισμὸν καὶ γῆς κτήσιν καὶ οἰκίας χρυσίον τε καὶ ἀργύρου, τὸ δ' αὖ, τὸ χρυσοῦν τε καὶ ἀργυροῦν, αὐτὸ οὐ πενομένῳ, ἀλλὰ φύσει ὄντε πλουσίῳ, τὰς ψυχὰς ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν ἀρχαίαν κατάστασιν ἡγέτην. I print the passage as it stands in Stallbaum and the Paris MS. But (1) ἔλκειν ἐπὶ in the sense of ἔλκεσθαι ἐπὶ seems unexampled, and τὰς ψυχὰς cannot be supplied: (2) τὰς ψυχὰς (with Stallbaum's punctuation) is in too emphatic a position: (3) ἡγέτην τὰς ψυχὰς is curious—could Plato have written ἐγὼ ἄγω τὴν (sc. ἐμὴν) ψυχὴν? Read εἰλκεῖσθην ἄρα—ἀλλὰ φύσει ὄντε πλουσίῳ τὰς ψυχὰς

(accusative of respect), ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν ἀρχαίαν κατάστασιν ἡγέσθην.

VIII. 559 E.—ἐνταῦθα πού οἱον ἐναὶ ἀρχὴν αὐτῷ μεταβολῆς ὀλιγαρχικῆς τῆς ἐν ἐαυτῷ εἰς δημοκρατικὴν. The reference is to the change from oligarchy to democracy within the man. As the text stands, μεταβολήν must be supplied with δημοκρατικὴν: but this would result in the wrong sense, if not in nonsense. We should either read for ὀλιγαρχικῆς and δημοκρατικὴν, ὀλιγαρχίας and δημοκρατίας, or insert πολιτείας after τῆς ἐν ἐαυτῷ.

VIII. 562 B.—ὁ προϋθετο, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ἀγαθόν, καὶ δι' οὗ ἡ ὀλιγαρχία καθίστατο—τοῦτο δ' ἦν ὑπὲρ πλοῦτος ἡ γὰρ; Madvig's emendation ὑπὲρ πλοῦτος is undoubtedly right, but the passage is not yet whole. It has not been said by Plato that wealth is the instrument, but the end, of the establishment of oligarchy: moreover ὑπὲρ πλοῦτος points in the same direction. Read καὶ δι' ὃ αὖ ἡ ὀλιγαρχία κ.τ.λ. καὶ is explanatory: 'in other words that for which oligarchy in its turn was established—that is, as we saw, for wealth, is it not?'

X. 606 C.—ἀρ' οὐχ ὁ αὐτὸς λόγος καὶ περὶ τοῦ γελοίου; οἷον αὐτὸς αἰσχύνειο γελοιοποιῶν, ἐν μυχῇ δὲ κομωδικῇ ἢ καὶ ἰδίᾳ ἀκούων σφόδρα χαίρει καὶ μὴ μισῆς ὡς πονηρά, ταῦτον ποιεῖς ὅπερ ἐν τοῖς ἐλέοις. This is the reading of the Paris MS. Stallbaum prints χαίρει for χαίρης, and ποιῶν for ποιεῖς, but in his note he suggests that the mark of interrogation should be placed after γελοιοποιῶν, and recommends the insertion of αὖ after ἀκούων. Madvig's emendation (accepted by Baiter) is ὅταν, αὖ αὐτὸς—ἐν μυχῇ δὲ ἡ—χαίρει—ἐλέοις; The contrast 'between αὐτὸς and ἐν μυχῇ κομωδικῇ makes it clear that δέ is not to be changed into δὴ. I have no doubt that Plato wrote ὅταν τι αὖ αὐτὸς αἰσχύνειο κ.τ.λ., i.e. 'whenever you would be ashamed to make a certain joke yourself, but are exceedingly delighted when you hear it in the imitation of comedy, etc., you do just the same as in commiseration.' The old reading ὅτι αὖ αὐτὸς αἰσχύνειο points to ὅταν at the beginning: and as the MSS. have αἰσχύνειο it is clear that there was an αὖ to go with it, so that we are forced to the reading ὅταν τι αὖ αὐτὸς αἰσχύνειο, which is moreover the only possible way to express the precise shade of meaning. αὖ αὐτὸς αἰσχύνειο is itself the apodosis to a (logically) suppressed protasis: and the idiom is in no way stranger than that commented on by Goodwin in *Moods and Tenses*, § 506, e.g. καὶ ἐγώ, εἴπερ ἄλλῳ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ περὶ θοίμην αὖ, καὶ σοὶ πείθεται (Plat. *Prot.* 329 B).

J. ADAM.

SOME READINGS OF PLATO'S *REPUBLIC* IN MS. gr. 1807 IN THE
LIBRARY AT PARIS (Bekker's Paris. A, Baiter's A, Hermann's P).

HAVING been engaged in preparing a text of Plato's *Republic*, I visited Paris in June 1890, for the purpose of verifying four or five readings which Baiter mentions doubtfully (with 'A (?)'). As the MS. had been repeatedly examined by eminent scholars,—Bekker, Dübner, K. F. Hermann, Baiter, Cobet,—it had not occurred to me that more than such a cursory inspection would be necessary. I remembered Bekker's words on hearing that Gaisford had collated the Bodleian MS.,—*nohū actum agere*. On being confronted with the MS., however, I

was led to read in it a little more widely, and, to my great surprise, discovered that many readings which in Par. A are quite distinct have somehow been misquoted in the editions. Schanz' collation of the chief MSS. of the *Republic* is not yet published. No doubt, when it appears, it will be complete. Meanwhile it is well that scholars should be apprised of the existing state of things. I therefore herewith append a list of 21 places selected from a considerably larger number, in which I found that Baiter's report was falsified by an inspection of the MS. itself.

Readings of Par. A, as now ascertained.

Ditto, do., as quoted by Baiter, ed. 1887.

- Plat. *Rep.*
I. 333 D. οὐκοῦν A : οὐκ ἂν οὖν A²mg.
„ 341 B. δ νῦν (δ in erasure).
II. 361 C. ἴτω corrected to ἦτω by A¹.
„ 367 D. κελεύεις (ε in erasure).
„ 383 A. γόητας ὄντας.
„ „ B. παιῶν.
III. 391 C. ὠρμησαν.
IV. 428 D. τελέους.
V. 450 B. μέτρον.
„ 479 C. ψ.
VI. 496 D. τῶ δικαίῳ.
„ 503 A. παρακαλυπτομένων.
VII. 534 C. φήσεις.
„ 535 C. πάντα.
VIII. 546 C. παρέχεται.
„ 559 A. ἀναγκαίους.
IX. 578 A. ὀδυρμούς τε.
(So Bekker).
X. 606 A. εἰ ἐκείνῃ.
„ 606 E. ἄξιος.
607 D. ἀπολογησαμένη pr. (corrected
by neat erasure to ἀπολογη-
σομένη).
614 B. ἐπειδὴ οὖν (sic) pr. : ἐπειδὴ οὖν
A²

- οὐκοῦν A cum altero (οὐκ ἂν οὖν an οὐκοῦν ?)
in margine ab eadem manu.
δ νῦν A (δν νῦν conj. Benedict).
ἦτω.
κελεύεις A¹ : κελεύεις A.²
'ὄντας om. A.'
παιῶν.
ὠρμησεν (in text—no variant given).^h
τελέως.
μέτριον.
ὦς.^h
τῶν δικαίων.^h
παρακαλύπτεσθαι.
οὐδὲν φήσεις A (1).
πάντα A (1).
παρέχεται.
ἀναγκαίας A (1).
ὀδυρμούς δὲ (in text—no variant given).
'εἰ om. A.'
ἄξιον (in text—no variant given).^h
ἀπολογησομένη (in text—no variant
given).^h
ἐπειδὴ ὃν A¹ :
ἐπειδὴ οὖν A².

The question of the bearing of these and other errors of collation on the constitution of the text must be reserved for the edition now in preparation by the Clarendon Press.

^h NOTE.—The errors marked with ^h are

repeated in the Hermann-Teubner edition. As only a selection of v.rr. is there given, the other places are perhaps simply omitted.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

2 CORINTHIANS VI. 14—VII. 1.

As the discussion of this passage is still going on, it may perhaps be worth while to point out that Mr. Whitelaw's interesting theory about it is not a new one. That the passage is an interpolation where it stands has been often maintained. Many contend that it was not written by St. Paul at all (e.g. Schrader, Holsten, Straatman, Baljon, and apparently Van Manen *Conjecturaal-Kritiek*, p. 294, Van de Sande Bakhuyzen *Over de Toepassing*, &c., p. 266). Others hold that it was really St. Paul's but not originally written for its present place (so Ewald and Chantepie de la Saussaye, *ap.* Van Manen, p. 295: Heinrici also adopts this view *Das zweite Sendschreiben*, &c., p. 334). But two critics at least, Hilgenfeld (*Einkl.* p. 287 n.) and Franke (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1884), had thrown out the same suggestion as Mr. Whitelaw—that the passage in question belonged to the lost letter referred to in 1 Cor. v. 9. On the other hand, two of the weightiest of recent writers, Weiss (*Einkl.* p. 220 n.) and Weizsäcker (*Apost. Zeitalt.* p. 318), join with Mr. Chase in rejecting all these alternatives and upholding the substantial integrity of the text as it has come down to us: Holtzmann, at least in the first edition of his Introduction, does not express any opinion. The fullest discussion with which I am acquainted is that by Heinrici (*ut sup.* pp. 329–334).

The arguments put forward by our English critics will, I think, well bear comparison with those which have been urged upon the Continent. Unfortunately, the case is one which does not seem to admit of a positive decision: the most we can reach is a certain balance of probability on the one side or on the other. I think we may dismiss the idea that the passage is spurious altogether (how weak are some of the arguments relied upon for this view may be seen in Bakhuyzen, p. 267, Heinrici, p. 333): but between Mr. Whitelaw and Mr. Chase it is less easy to decide. It is true that there is considerable abruptness of transition: but that abruptness, as Weiss and Weizsäcker as well as Mr. Chase maintain, may not be so great as appears at first sight; and we must also admit that St. Paul is capable of abrupt transitions. Still I confess that the view of Hilgenfeld, Franke and Mr. Whitelaw would have a rather strong attraction for me, if I could only get over the initial difficulty of supposing an interpolation in a text which is

so unanimously attested, and of framing to myself a satisfactory hypothesis as to the way in which that interpolation came in. Heinrici's contention that there is an unusual amount of uncertainty in the text of the passage does not seem to be borne out. The readings which he quotes are all of the same character, and only such as distinguish the groups by which they are supported elsewhere. The evidence for the passage is practically unbroken. It is natural to ask if Marcion had it; and it seems on the whole probable from the way in which Tertullian quotes 2 Cor. vii. 1 (*Adv. Marc.* v. 12), and from the absence of any statement to the contrary either in Tertullian or Epiphanius, that he had. In any case the archetype of our existing MSS. must go up well to the time of Marcion. Again, Clement of Rome assumes that the First Epistle at least is kept by the Corinthians among their archives (*ad Cor.* 47. 1); and when Dionysius of Corinth refers to the practice of his church to bring out from time to time and read Clement's own Epistle (*Eus. H.E.* iv. 23. 11) we can hardly be wrong in supposing that this practice would extend to the writings of the Apostle. We are thus brought almost to the threshold of the Apostolic age, and the security for the safe transmission of the text would be as good as any of which we have record.

I am aware that our German friends do not hesitate to assume an interpolation wherever they want it. I am aware also that Old Testament scholars have shown considerable reason for admitting not only large incorporations like Isa. xl.–lxvi. but small ones like Isa. xiii. 1–xiv. 23, xxiv.–xxvii. &c., in the writings of the prophets. Cases like these last involve less difficulty because of the wider interval between the dates of composition and the appearance of the first complete text, as well as from the vicissitudes of siege and sack and exile to which the Old Testament writings must have been exposed. It cannot be said that 2 Corinthians is upon the same footing with these. Within the New Testament we may be willing enough to admit interpolations of which traces are left in MSS. or versions, and willing even, it may be, to admit other interpolations analogous to these without documentary authority; but here the question is whether we have any true analogy, and there is a further question how the process of interpolation is

to be conceived of. We must remember that in the Apostolic age we have to deal with rolls not books. I doubt if more than a single epistle was ever included in a single roll. We might imagine the lost epistle of 1 Cor. v. 9 frayed away or torn and so reduced to a fragment: but it is another thing to have this fragment introduced into the body of the Second Epistle. I will not say positively that it could not be; but examples like the *pericope adulterae*, or the

last twelve verses of St. Mark, tell against rather than for the hypothesis, because, early as they are, there is a divergent tradition still earlier. In the absence of such a tradition I should feel obliged to say to Mr. Whitelaw, with full recognition of the force of his arguments and of the attractiveness of the hypothesis which he builds upon them, not perhaps 'not true,' but at least 'not proven.'

W. SANDAY.

KELLER'S XENOPHON'S *HELLENICA*.

Ξενοφώντος Ἑλληνικά. Xenophontis *Historia Graeca*. Recensuit OTTO KELLER. Editio maior cum apparatu critico et indice verborum. Lipsiae: Teubner, 1890. 10 Mk.

THIS is one of the volumes with the familiar blue wrapper, which by the beauty of their type, accuracy of execution and general completeness have brought the house of Teubner into such favour with scholars in all parts of the world. The want of a really good edition of the *Hellenica* with a full and properly digested *apparatus criticus* has long been felt. Such an one was promised ten years ago by Otto Riemann, but this eminent French scholar seems to have abandoned his project. Another Otto has undertaken and completed the task in a volume, which will be hailed with delight by scholars and book-lovers, the most fastidious of whom cannot fail to be satisfied with the general completeness of the volume.

A well-written preface gives a succinct and remarkably clear account of the MSS which have been specially collated for this edition. The best of all is generally admitted to be the Paris *B*, which, however, does not go back further than the beginning of the xivth century. It is for the most part carefully transcribed, but several pages of the seventh Book have been lost and there are one or two passages where the volume has suffered from mutilation. Louis Dindorf professed to have collated this MS accurately, but his collation, though, as might be expected, considerably more trustworthy than that of Gail, leaves something to be desired, as Professor Keller points out in the case of several readings, which have been wrongly ascribed to it by him. Even Sauppe and other editors have not given an entirely accurate account of its variants. The MS, it is true, is full of

slips and errors, but most of these are so obviously absurd, that they are not likely to mislead even the least learned reader. The Milan MS *M*, also of the xivth century, remarkable for its clear and distinct writing, has been collated for the Editor with unusual care, the first Book by the late Professor W. Studemund of Strasburg, and the fifth Book by F. Rühl of Königsberg, the remaining book by F. Villa. Riemann was the first to draw attention to the excellence of this MS, in a paper contributed to the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 1878, which was followed by an essay on the text of the *Hellenica* in the year following; in which he shows that it preserves the true reading in more places than either *B* or any of the other MSS of Xenophon. On the other hand it does not supply the place of *B*, because there are many passages which could never have been correctly restored, had the latter been lost.

A third but less important MS *D* in the National Library at Paris, belonging to the same family as *M* and of the xvth century, has been collated afresh. This MS requires to be used with care, because the copyist has supplied its frequent *lacunae* with conjectures of his own, without consulting other MSS. These our Editor very properly takes no notice of in his critical apparatus. It alone gives the reading *παρόδους* for *πόλεις* in IV iv 18. Sauppe formed too high an estimate of this MS—which contains also the *Memoabilia Hieron* and *Agésilas*—but his collation of it like that by L. Dindorf, as Keller shows, is imperfect.

The two other *codices deteriores melioris classis*, viz. *V* and *L*, both of the xivth century, the former in St. Mark's Library at Venice, the latter in that of Paris, have likewise been collated anew. The transcriber of the former seems to have been more or less of a

scholar; he has marked several passages as corrupt and several of his conjectural emendations have approved themselves to modern critics; but in other places he has introduced violent and uncalled for changes. The collation of the latter—which is closely related to it—made by J. A. Simon has not been used except in a few passages.

Lastly, there are two MS, *F* (in Leyden of the xvth century), and *C* (in Paris also of the xvth century), the readings of which are occasionally given by the editor: in some places *C* alone of all MSS has preserved the true reading of the *archetypus codex*, and they are both of use in supplying the gaps found in the better MSS.

Professor Keller has a convenient designation of the consensus between the several MSS. enumerated above, by different letters of the alphabet, thus Ω = BCFM etc. The conjectural emendations of the older scholars Henri Estienne, Pirckheimer, Löwenklau—have been received or mentioned, together with those of modern critics including Madvig, Kurz, Cobet and Hartman.

The complete Index of words, the credit of which is due to F. Stolle and Fr. Köppner, cannot fail to add to the value of an edition, which merits unqualified praise, and will be found a great boon to students of Xenophon.

H. A. HOLDEN.

HARTMAN'S ANALECTA NOVA XENOPHONTEA.

Analecta nova Xenophontea: scripsit I. I. HARTMAN. Lugd. Bat. 1889. 10 Mk.

THIS volume forms a sequel to the work favourably noticed in Vol. iii p. 405 f, (where, by the way, the author's name is incorrectly given as I. T. Hartmann). The writer expresses his regret that he did not publish the two volumes in one with the emended title *de Xenophontis vita scriptisque commendatio*. His readers will probably regret that he did not see fit to reduce his two volumes into a much smaller compass. He writes, it is true, with a facile pen, and his command over the Latin language enables him to express his thoughts in a clear and vigorous style, not least so where he borrows his illustration from familiar modern topics, such as Alpine climbers, horses taking fright at steam engines, etc. etc.

More than two thirds of the publication before us is taken up with the *Cyropaedia*; the remaining third deals with such of Xenophon's minor writings as were not noticed in the former part. The studies in the *Cyropaedia* begin with a long and discursive essay entitled *de Xenophonte e Cyropaedia cognoscendo*. Dr. Hartman starts with the assumption that the work is not a mere historical romance any more than it is a genuine and real history, but an elaborate device adopted by Xenophon for expounding his own views and giving to the world the results of his own experience of life. For what else are the sentiments put into the mouth of the hero of the work but an echo of the author's own? What are the incidents recorded in

the *Cyropaedia* but so many reminiscences of similar events which happened within the writer's own experience, as recorded in the *Anabasis*? (Compare *Cyr.* VII v 22 with *Anab.* V ii 24 ff., *Cyr.* IV i 10, iii 4 with *Anab.* III ii 19, *Cyr.* V iv 18, 20 with *Anab.* V iv 16—21). The book moreover abounds in traces of Socratic teaching. In his second chapter Dr. Hartman, following in the steps of his great master C. G. Cobet, controverts the generally received opinion as to the authenticity of the *Epilogue* or concluding Chapter of the VIIIth Book.

Before proceeding with his critical comments on the *Cyropaedia*, Dr. Hartman has a chapter *de philologis operam perdentibus*, in which he complains of the excessive deference, which it is the fashion, especially in Germany, to pay to 'diplomatic probability,' as the chief, if not the only proper test of a correct reading. *Codicum stemmata conficere*, he exclaims, *nunc philologicae artis fastigium videtur*. If critics were agreed about the pedigree of MSS., we might expect more satisfactory results. As it is, the text of Greek authors is frequently disfigured by vicious readings, which have been adopted to the extrusion of those generally received. These remarks have a special bearing on Arnold Hug's treatment of the text of the *Cyropaedia*. Dr. Hartman does not withhold from him the deserved tribute of praise, as a *vir prudentissimus et haud mediocri acumine atque doctrina*, but he takes exceptions to some of his innovations, which in his judgment are absurdly improbable. The worst of all is a passage in Book V v 22, where, in answer to the complaint of his

jealous uncle Cyaxares that he had taken unfair advantage of his kindness and eclipsed him in the estimation of his subjects, Cyrus, after saying that he had merely asked him to permit Median volunteers to join him in his projected campaign, continues thus:—*οὐκοῦν παρὰ σοῦ τούτου τυχὼν οὐδὲν ἦν, εἰ μὴ τούτους πείραμι* i.e. 'if I got this concession from you, I was nothing (no good), if I failed to get their consent.' Dr. Hartman condemns Hug for recalling what he calls the absurd reading *οὐδὲν ἦν*—which is that of the four best MSS—instead of adopting the correction *οὐδὲν ἦνον*, which is due to a second hand in one of them and found its way into the Aldine and Juntine Editions. Hug quotes one passage from VI ii 8 to justify his choice, but Dr. Hartman is not satisfied; perhaps he might have been, had he remembered his Aristophanes, who has two instances of the phrase, *Vespae* 1504 *ἐν τῷ ἄνθρῳ γὰρ οὐδὲν ἔστι* and *Eccles.* 144 *ὃν μὲν βιάδιζε καὶ κάθητο*. *οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐλ*. Hug is probably right in this as in most of the other readings which Hartman selects for adverse criticism.

Chapter IV, extending over more than 100 pages, contains critical comments on passages of the *Cyropaedia*, 140 of which are taken from the five first Books, but in at least 100 of these the writer of this notice is unable to detect any difficulty that cannot be solved on the ordinary principles of Greek syntax. There are not more than 14 of the remainder in which Dr Hartman's observations serve to elucidate the meaning, while ten or more have been already satisfactorily explained in commentaries which he does not appear to have consulted. The same observation applies equally to the critical comments on the *Hieron* and other minor writings, a detailed examination of which would be impossible in a short notice like the present.

Dr. Hartman differs very decidedly in opinion from Cobet as to the authorship of the essay 'on the Spartan constitution'; he regards it as a scholastic compilation, the

clumsy work of some *ludimagister insulsus arrogans, verborum et sententiuncularum auceps*. He agrees with most critics in considering the tract 'on the Athenian constitution'—which strangely resembles Machiavelli's 'Prince'—as an anonymous production, not however that of a contemporary politician—such as Critias Alcibiades or Phrynichus—but rather of some later compiler, who had no other sources of information but those which are open to us, especially Aristophanes and Xenophon. As to its being the earliest specimen of Attic prose—he considers that it does not bear the smallest resemblance in style to Antiphon or Thucydides. Of the three technical tracts ascribed to Xenophon two—the *Hipparchicus*, and that 'on the Horse'—carry with them unquestionable proofs of being genuine, the third—that 'on Hunting'—Dr. Hartman considers quite unworthy of Xenophon: it is, he thinks, the composition of some *Ἰεροπαριδὲς qui arroganter et rixantis in modum loqui a magistro suo didicit*, though he admits that he has no practical knowledge of the subject himself, nor does he know any brother philologist who has. Such is the degeneracy of the modern Dutch scholars, whose compatriots—the Ruhnken Lenneps and other celebrities—were in their day as distinguished in the hunting-field as they were in the field of Greek scholarship.

It is impossible to lay down this volume without a feeling of gratitude to the writer for his contribution to our knowledge of Xenophon and for the interest he has succeeded in imparting to his writings. There is not a dull page throughout, and though, as a whole, it does not rise to the level of its predecessor, it is full of instruction, even where the conclusions of the writer provoke difference of opinion. It is a pity that a book, so elegantly got up, should be disfigured by such misprints as *vellit* (for *velit*), *deviciendi*, *coelo*, *lasciniæ*, which are only a few specimens, taken at random.

H. A. HOLDEN.

ADAM'S PLATONIS EUTHYPHRO.

Platonis Euthyphro, with Introduction and Notes by J. ADAM, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. 1890. (pp. xxviii. 107.) 2s. 6d.

THIS edition would bear pruning, but is highly to be commended on the whole. Mr.

Adam proves himself thoroughly competent for the work he undertakes. He evades no difficulty, and he is generally most successful where the difficulty is greatest. His elaborate notes on IV. 4 A, 4 D, V. 5 A, IX. 8 A, XX. 15 D, for example, might perhaps be shortened with advantage, but they are

entirely sound. In more than one instance Mr. Adam's independent conclusion is to be preferred to that of Schanz or Cobet. The following may be quoted as giving a fair impression of the commentary:—

IV. 4, Β ἄνθρωπος is not = 'although,' a meaning which it never bears, but 'that is to say, if.' Euthyphro implies that one is not bound to prosecute unless the guilty man lives under one's own roof: only then is one exposed to *μίσση*. XIII. 11, C. *τοῖσιν* is wrongly rejected by Stallbaum: it goes with *ἐνθιβεῖς*, by the usual Platonic hyperbaton, on which see Riddell's *Apology of Plato*, p. 236 ff., and Prof. Cook Wilson 'On the Interpretation of Plato's *Timaeus*,' p. 97 ff. Schanz remarks that its position is determined by the paronomasia with *τοῖσιν*, and quotes the parallel in *Phaed.* 239 A.

The editor's remarks on IX. 8 D, XI. 9 C, although equally ingenious, are less convincing.

The Introduction touches on the same topics as those dwelt on by Professor Jowett, and to much the same effect. Both seem to agree that the truth hinted at in the *Euthyphro* but not expressed is that 'piety consists in working under God for the production of some good result not specified' (p. xiv.). 'When we expect him to go on and show that the true service of the Gods is the service of the Spirit, and the co-operation

with them in all things true and good, he stops short; this was a lesson which the soothsayer could not have been made to understand, and which every one must learn for himself' (Jowett). The coincidence is the more striking in that our editor, who is most conscientious in acknowledging obligations, makes no reference to the earlier and abler writing.

As I hinted at first, some things in this edition might be dispensed with. Citations, especially of German books, are needlessly profuse. What need we Nägelsbach to tell us that 'it had been a common-place with Pindar, Aeschylus, and other writers of a lofty moral tone, to urge that goodness must needs be one of the divine attributes' (xix.)? Or why must the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* be dragged in to prove that sacrifice was 'originally the gods' food' (xxii.)? In the notes also there are some things that might well be spared. Too much is sometimes made of accidental coincidences (IV. 4 A *πετόμενον τινα διώκεις*). And here and there a note is quite away from the point (XI. 9 C *ὥστε τοῦτον ἀφηνίμει σε*). Altogether, the little book might be made better by being made still smaller. But, as it is, it is decidedly good.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

AELIUS DIONYSIUS AND PAUSANIAS, THE ATTICISTS.

ΑΙΛΙΟΥ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΥΣΑΝΙΟΥ
ΟΝΟΜΑΤΑ ΑΤΤΙΚΑ. Aelii Dionysii et
Pausaniae Atticistarum Fragmenta colle-
git ERNESTUS SCHWABE. Accedunt Frag-
menta Lexicorum Rhetoricorum apud
Eustathium laudata. Lipsiae. Sumptibus
Dykianis. 1890. pp. vi. 282. Mk. 12.

THE fame of these two Atticists of the age of Hadrian is closely bound up with the fame of other distinguished Greek scholars, some their predecessors, some their followers, from Aristophanes and Aristarchus in the third century B.C. to Cobet and Naber in our own day. Between these two extremes are many more, who either contributed to or borrowed—in too many cases stole—from these 'cabinets of precious rarities.' The most honest among the borrowers was Eustathius, who never attempts to conceal the source from which he derives his knowledge; yet he often cites his authorities so vaguely as to make it very difficult to trace his glosses to their true author. Were it not for this carelessness, the collection of

the fragments of Aelius and Pausanias would be a far easier matter than it is.

To Cobet belongs the honour of having been the first to point out the immense value of the glosses in the twelfth century lexicographers. The year 1860, in which Cobet published his first paper on Photius, is an epoch in the study of the Attic Dialect. In a second paper, in 1861, he dealt with the relations of that lexicographer to the Atticists. Cobet's conclusions, it is true with some important reservations, still hold good. About the same time (1861 and 1863) appeared Meier's *Opuscula*, in which he dealt with the Atticists, and made the first systematic collection of their fragments from Eustathius. In 1866, W. Rindfleisch wrote an Academic dissertation on the same subject. He added from Eustathius twenty-five fragments of Pausanias and twenty-two of Aelius to those given by Meier. He also contested some of Cobet's views. Cobet says (*Mnem.* x. p. 54 fol.) that, as Photius considered Aelius and Pausanias to be of the highest value—*χρησιμώτατος τοῖς τε ἀττικίζουσιν*

ἔχονσι φροντίδα καὶ τοῖς τῶν Ἀττικῶν συγγράμμασιν ἐνομιλεῖν προαιρουμένοις—and as a comparison of the remains of Photius' Lexicon with Eustathius shows that Photius constantly transcribed Aelius and Pausanias verbatim, therefore we are justified in attributing to the Atticists anything that is common to Photius and any other known excerptor of Pausanias and Aelius. Thus the author of the *Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίων* 'κ διαφορῶν σοφῶν τε καὶ ῥητόρων πολλῶν, (being the sixth lexicon in Bekker's *Anecdota*, p. 319) copied, not Photius, as Dobree said, but the Atticists. Moreover Suidas 'descripsit Photium.' Therefore from the Atticists comes anything which appears both in B.A.G. *l.c.* and in Suidas. For instance, ἀβέλτερος, ἀγαπησμός, ἀγῆλαι, ἀγκράτος, come from Aelius. So too many others. Not one of these words appears in Schwabe's book; and the reason will presently be apparent.

Cobet goes further. He attributes to Aelius (why not also to Pausanias?) all passages of Suidas (or Photius) which have λέγονσι without Ἀττικοί appended; all glosses in B.A.G. *l.c.* with ὡς ἡμεῖς added—even though such glosses be not contained in both of these sources. Thus, in B.A.G. Ἄρκτον, though not in Suidas, in Suidas Ἀνάδοχον, ἀναλίσκειν and so forth, though wanting in B.A.G., come from Aelius. Cobet gives many other examples from Photius, of which I find only πᾶν and πεντέπηχυ (with its companions) in Schwabe, who in both cases quotes from Eustathius. For Schwabe arranges his book in two parts, the first of which contains only the fragments which Eustathius expressly assigns to Aelius and Pausanias, with so much of the context as may be reasonably connected therewith; and the second part the fragments of the *Λεξικά ῥητορικά*, many of which can be proved to belong to the Atticists. Cobet is as usual daring, brilliant, incisive. 'Sine ulla dubitatione ad verbum descripta sunt.' 'Sic scribere potuit eruditissimus Atticista Hadriani temporibus, non Suidas et Photius.' And so on.

If Cobet errs on the side of audacity, Rindfleisch represents the extreme of caution. Eustathius, he says, consulted other lexica besides those of Aelius and Pausanias. For that reason he omits all passages cited by Eustathius from the *Λεξ. ῥητ.*, without name. Yet he allows that if such a passage is found also in some other known excerptor of the Atticists, such as B.A.G. *l.c.* or Photius, that passage will probably be due to Aelius or Pausanias. But as these excerptors had other authorities who were also used by Eustathius, we cannot be certain. This he illus-

trates with *ἀστούζενος*. Eustathius first quotes Aelius by name, then Pausanias. Then he adds *ἔτεροι δὲ οὕτω*. B.A.G. *l.c.* gives the explanation which Eustathius ascribes to *ἔτεροι*; i.e. the compiler here used some author, other than the Atticists, whom Eustathius also used. But, since the discovery of the Codex Athous, we know that Aelius and Pausanias both copied Aristophanes here. Probably therefore Schwabe (p. 44) is right in saying that *ἔτεροι δὲ* gives us, not another lexicon cited by Eustathius but merely another *χρήσις* which he found in Pausanias. Besides, Rindfleisch overlooked the fact that Hesychius also gives both the explanation expressly ascribed to Pausanias and this other *χρήσις* together, and therefore found them in his authority together. We must agree with Naber (*Prol. ad Phot.* p. 27) and Schwabe (p. 79), that Diogenianus is the common source of the glosses which are common to Hesychius and the Atticists. I should therefore suppose that this *ἔτεροι δὲ* was found in Diogenianus, who found it in Pamphilus; and that thus the whole of the gloss in Eustathius goes back in direct ascent to Aristophanes. Rindfleisch concludes that we must be satisfied with those passages which Eustathius gives with the name of Aelius or Pausanias attached, and that, even with these, it is often hard to determine how much really comes from the Atticists, how much was added by the bishop.

Cobet's articles were followed in the sixties by Naber's admirable edition of Photius; and that again by Schwartz' edition of the fragments of Aelius Dionysius (Utrecht 1877). Naber held that of the two editions which Photius says he had of Aelius, the shorter was an epitome of the longer. This opinion is accepted by Schwabe without discussion. It was rejected by Schwartz; and Engelhoff, who reviewed Schwartz' book in Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, thinks rightly rejected. If Naber is right, Photius must be wrong; since he says that the second edition was an expansion of the first. Schwabe shows that in two places only does Eustathius mention two editions; but he thinks that when Eustathius quotes Aelius or Pausanias and *ἔτερόν τι Λεξ. ῥητ.*, he is referring to the fact that he had two editions of Aelius. Unfortunately Schwartz gave as the fragments of Aelius a hasty and preposterous compound from the various excerptors of the Atticists. He followed, without question, Naber's list of the excerptors: so that the glosses in Schwartz's volume are a mere patch-work, with notes appended to inform us from what rag-bag he took the bits. Nor should he

have attempted a presentment of the fragments of Aelius, apart from those of Pausanias; since there are many passages which beyond doubt belong to one or the other scholar, but may belong equally well to either. His 'verisimilia' and 'incerta,' which depend on the assumption that Suidas copied Photius, and that we can recognise, as Cobet put it, Aelius' orationem manumque in Suidas and B.A.G. *l.c.* even when the gloss is not found in Eustathius—which depend, in fact, upon the Dutch doctrine—are, of course, not included by Schwabe.

The Dutch doctrine has been widely discussed. Its champions were Cobet, Naber, Schwart, Stoientin and Zarncke. I hope to notice soon a pamphlet of importance by the last mentioned in this *Review*. The Dutch doctrine was combated by Boysen, Freyer, and Röllig. In the *Dissertationes Phil. Halenses*, vol. viii. 1887, Röllig, having gone right through Photius, showed that up to a third of Photius' glosses are wanting in Suidas, from ρ onwards about a fifth. Therefore, he argues, Suidas had an authority whom Photius had not. Nearly all the glosses expressly assigned by Eustathius to Aelius or Pausanias appear in Photius; very few of them are found in Suidas. And Suidas has two glosses, $\kappa\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\alpha$ and $\kappa\acute{\rho}\alpha\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$, which Eustathius assigns to Aelius, and which are looked for in vain in Photius. Even what remains under α in Photius proves that he has many glosses in common with the second series in B.A.G. *l.c.* Now, while Suidas has many glosses from the first series of this $\Sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\gamma\eta$, he has not one from the second. Röllig shows clearly that Suidas used sources which Photius used, but had not seen his work. It is not possible to assume, without other evidence, that anything in Suidas comes from the Atticists.

The discovery of the Codex Athous, containing fragments of Aristophanes of Byzantium, made it clear that Nauck was mistaken in supposing that Eustathius obtained his knowledge of Aristophanes at second hand. The whole subject of the authorities of Eustathius is dealt with by L. Cohn, *Jahrbücher für class. Phil.* xii. p. 285 fol. He considers that Aelius and Pausanias went to Pamphilus, and Photius to Aelius and Pausanias, for what they knew of Aristophanes. Naber, on the contrary, thinks that the Atticists knew Aristophanes only through Tryphon and Diogenianus. Schwabe, in dealing with the authorities of our lexicographers, agrees that the chief source of their knowledge of Athenian antiquities was Aristophanes; but often they went for their information not

direct to him, but to Didymus Chalcenterus, or to Pamphilus, who used Didymus, or even to Diogenianus, who epitomised Vestinus' epitome of Pamphilus. On grammatical points, Schwabe admits that Aelius used Tryphon: and he may have known him partly through Herodian. If the Atticists had Aristophanes complete—a question to which Schwabe should have sought some answer—it is strange that they did not always go direct to him. But I may observe that the inheritors of the Alexandrine erudition seem to have consulted by preference the works of their immediate predecessors, when they had them at hand; and that the evidence, incomplete and unsatisfactory as it is, seems to show that the Atticists had Aristophanes only in excerpts. According to Cohn's view, the excerpts were those contained in Pamphilus' $\Delta\epsilon\iota\phi\acute{\omega}\nu$. So incomplete and so unsatisfactory is the evidence that there are not wanting scholars, as Weber and Boysen, who think that Diogenianus copied the Atticists; while Schwabe agrees with Naber that the Atticists copied Diogenianus.

Such, in the barest outline, is the history of these two Atticists. It is clear that a new edition of the fragments was much needed; and Schwabe is no novice in this kind of work. He is already known as the author of *Quaestiones de Scholiorum Thucydideorum fontibus* (Leipziger Studien iv.); in the third chapter of that inquiry he seeks to show that the Atticists were widely used in the Scholia to Thucydides. He argues that when Photius and the Scholia agree, the common source of both is Aelius or Pausanias. That this is at least sometimes the case he proves by quotations from Eustathius. So too when Hesychius and the Scholia agree. The same method was followed by Freyer in his *Quaest. de Schol. Aeschineorum fontibus*; and it is similar to Cobet's argument. From this it might have been expected that anything Schwabe might write of the Atticists would be both daring and original. His edition is neither. It is studiously cautious, and follows closely the lines of the latest writers.

The main questions discussed in the eighty pages of Prolegomena are four: (1) What constitutes the fragments of Aelius and Pausanias? (2) What was the method of Eustathius in quoting the Atticists? (3) What was the condition of their works in the days of Eustathius? (4) From what authorities did they draw? The mere enumeration shows that Schwabe has become cautious. For he takes Eustathius, not Photius, to be the final authority for the fragments of Pausanias

and Aelius. As for those of the *λεξικά ῥητορικά*, some are assigned by Eustathius in other places to Pausanias or Aelius: most appear in some known excerptor of them—in Photius, *B.A.G. l.c.*, Suidas *Et. Mag.*, Moeris or Hesychius. He should have given a full list, supported by argument, of the excerptors of the Atticists. Some of the fragments of the *λεξ. ῥητ.* he thinks may have come from the *λεξικὸν ἀνώνυμον* used by Eustathius.

The title assigned to Aelius' work varies. The editor argues that the title given to it by Photius in the *Myriobiblon*—*Ἀττικῶν ὀνομάτων λόγοι πέντε*—is the correct one. Similarly Pausanias' work was probably called *Ἀττικά ὀνόματα*. Schwabe rightly rejects Naber's opinion that Eustathius used two editions of Pausanias. In one of the passages brought forward by Naber, Eustathius, after referring to Pausanias, does say: *ἐν ἑτέρῳ δὲ ῥητορικῷ γράφει*, but there are fair grounds for substituting *γράφεται*, and assuming that Eustathius refers to Aelius. How is it that Eustathius and the *Et. Mag.* quote the Atticists with the title *λεξικὸν ῥητορικόν*, and that the authors are called *ῥήτορες*? To this question, Meier's answer (*Opusc. II. p. 62*) is that *ὁ ῥήτωρ* in late Greek includes almost any prose writer, and that the Atticists wrote dictionaries relating to prose. The difficulty in the way of this explanation is that they quote the Tragedians freely. Schwabe's view is that *ῥητορικόν* has here a passive sense—'a dictionary for those who wish to speak pure Attic'—and he quotes Photius' title, *λεξικὸν κατὰ στοιχείον, δι' ὧν ῥητόρων τε πόντοι καὶ συγγραφεῖων ἐξωρίζονται μάλιστα*. The point at issue is, how was the term used in the time of Eustathius, not in the time of Aelius? What constitutes the difference at that time between *ῥήτωρ* and *συγγραφεὺς* or *λογογράφος*? The former are probably Greek Professors, the latter authors, and probably *λεξικὸν ῥητορικόν* means a composition, or common-place book. Whatever meaning Eustathius attached to *ῥήτωρ*, it seems clear that the Atticists did not fully realise the essential difference between the diction of Prose, Tragedy, and Comedy.

As to the meaning of the phrases *οἱ παλαιοί, κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς, παρὰ τοῖς π.*, in Eustathius, no very satisfactory solution has yet been found. Cobet says the classical authors are always meant; that therefore every word which bears this precious hallmark is genuine gold. Freyer and Engeloff agree that this is the case, but qualify the assertion by the assumption that Eustathius found the phrases already in the

Atticists. Schwabe seems to think that Eustathius designated any author whom he consulted as *ὁ παλαιός*, whether scholiasts, grammarians, lexicographers or others. Yet he admits that the bishop does sometimes use *οἱ παλαιοί* in the sense of 'veteres ipsi, non lexicographi,' i.e. that sometimes he found the title in his authorities. The meaning of these, as also of *ὁ γράψας, ὁ εἰπών*, in Eustathius, requires further investigation.

In Chap. iii. the editor shows that Eustathius habitually quotes different glosses of the Atticists together: as many as thirty occur. In arranging the fragments Schwabe has not attempted to separate them, but left them with their surroundings as he found them. The result of Eustathius' method was to make it appear as though he were quoting from a thesaurus arranged according to subjects, instead of alphabetically, as we know the Atticists' works to have been. This chapter contains nothing new, and is marred by some repetition. More interesting and more important is Chap. iv. which deals with the origin of the blunders in Eustathius. Naber showed that the Atticists were human enough to err. But the bishop is at times so intensely human as to make ridiculous errors. So says Schwabe: but these absurd mistakes may sometimes be due to the scribes of Eustathius. Schwabe also points out that Eustathius, Photius, and Hesychius show identical corruptions, which shows that in their time the texts of the Atticists were corrupt. Cobet pointed this out in the case of *B.A.G. l.c.* and Suidas. Chap. v., the last of the *Prolegomena*, is an examination into the sources from which Aelius and Pausanias drew. The editor states the case with candour and, of necessity, with some obscurity. He allows that much is uncertain, and that much is left for future labour to unravel. The Atticists' authorities are of four classes. (i) *Works on Athenian Antiquities*; the chief author is Aristophanes. In both writers occur fragments of Aristophanes extant in the *Cod. Athous*. (ii) *Books on Grammar and Orthography*. Probably Aelius consulted Tryphon freely; but there is no evidence that Pausanias used him. In this section we find ourselves in the region of pure conjecture. This much is certain and consolatory: however the grammatical glosses were obtained, they are, as Cobet declared, genuine remains of Alexandrine learning. (iii) *Collections of Proverbs*: these glosses come from Pausanias, who probably used Aristotle, Aristides, Zenobius. This subject has been dealt with by Rindfleisch and Hotop. Schwabe merely

says he follows the latter. He should at least have given his arguments. (iv.) *The results of their own reading*; especially in Thucydides. Cobet (*Mnem.* x. p. 84-94) already showed the value of the Atticists in studying the text of Thucydides. They are not so strict as Phrynichus, since they admit the new Comedy as evidence for Attic. What was the relation between them and their contemporaries Pollux and Harpocration, Schwabe leaves undecided. Nor has he any fresh information about the author called Ἀντιρριχτιδής (B.A.G. p. 77). He even omits to say that this author has something in common with the fragments of Aristophanes. In concluding he reverts to the cautious subject with which he began, by admitting that the Scholia do not contain so much of the Atticists as he formerly supposed.

The new editor has done good service to Aelius and Pausanias. The value of his service may be gauged by comparing his Index of the authors quoted by them with the corresponding enumeration at p. 17 of Rindfleisch's dissertation. For instance, in Rindfleisch's fragments, Aristophanes com. is referred to eight times: in Schwabe's,

twenty-four times. But it would be rash to imagine that we have here the final edition. Probably when the fragments of all the grammarians are collected with the care of Nauck and the caution of Schwabe, when Boysen's promised edition of Eudemus has appeared—even then, perhaps, not until a new edition of Eustathius is available—we shall know all that can be known of the relations between Photius and Suidas, recover all that remains of the Atticists and the other authorities of Eustathius. A little wit with some malice might prompt a critic to jest at these imperfect beginnings of so vast an enterprise as the collection and comparison of the successors of the Alexandrines. But Schwabe is well aware that his work lacks finality. 'Fundamentum solidum struere visi sumus, in quo ipsa illa aedes atticismo purissimo sacra a posterioribus, si Deo placet, exstruatur.' Though we still feel that there is much that we do not understand, he has at least helped us towards the possession of the old Aelius and the old Pausanias. After how long a time shall we possess and understand *The New Aelius* and *The New Pausanias*?

E. C. MARCHANT.

WERNER'S ST. PAUL AND IRENAEUS.

Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur von Oscar von GEBHARDT und ADOLF HARNACK. VI. Band. Heft 2. *Der Paulinismus des Irenaeus Eine Kirchen- und dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung über das Verhältniss des Irenaeus zu der Paulinischen Briefsammlung und Theologie.* Von Lic. DR. JOHANNES WERNER, Privatdocent an der Universität Marburg. Leipzig, 1889. pp. 218.

THIS work is divided into two parts of equal length. In the first part the relation of Irenaeus to the writings of S. Paul is investigated on the historical side; in the second, on the dogmatical side. In the first part an answer is sought to the question, What kind of authority had S. Paul and his writings for Irenaeus, and what kind of interest had he in them? The results of this investigation throw light upon the wider question, How did the Epistles of S. Paul win their way to general recognition as canonical? In the second part the question to be answered is, How far does the teaching of Irenaeus respecting leading

articles of the Christian faith agree with that of the Apostle? The answer to this question is a contribution to the history of primitive Christian doctrine.

Dr. Werner gives a list of treatises and articles on Irenaeus which fills two pages, but says that a great deal still remains to be done, and that he has not derived much help from any of the existing literature, excepting Ritschl's *Alt-katholische Kirche* and Harnack's *Dogmengeschichte* with the monographs of Ziegler and Lipsius.

Harvey in his edition of Irenaeus gives 324 references to the Pauline Epistles; but many of these are of too vague a character to be admitted as quotations or reminiscences. Werner reduces the number to 206, which number does not include the 18 cases in which Irenaeus mentions that heretics quoted S. Paul in defence of their views. These 206 citations are thus distributed: Romans, 54; 1 Corinthians, 68; 2 Corinthians, 13; Galatians, 24; Ephesians, 16; Colossians, 7; 1 Thessalonians, 2; 2 Thessalonians, 9; 1 Timothy, 2; 2 Timothy, 2; Titus, 2. The number of quotations increases, as the work progresses; but apparently this is caused by the

arrangement of the subject-matter. There is nothing to show that the writings of S. Paul had acquired greater authority in the eyes of Irenaeus during the years in which he was engaged in writing the work on heresies. He treats them throughout as of authority; but probably he did not put them on the same level as the Gospels or the Old Testament. Not one of the 206 quotations from S. Paul is introduced with the formula, 'The Scripture saith,' He cites him as 'the Apostle,' not as Scripture; and 'the Apostle' seems to mean the writer himself, not a recognized collection of his Epistles. Yet it would be difficult to show that there is any essential difference between the authority which Irenaeus assigns to the Old Testament and the Gospels and that which he assigns to the writings of S. Paul. Dr. Werner thinks that, in the first instance, not only Irenaeus, but the primitive Church generally, was led to treat the Pauline Epistles as canonical more because they were found to be invaluable for polemical purposes, than because their contents were specially attractive, or were recognized as specially edifying. He thinks also that what delayed their full recognition as Scripture was not the fact that they emanated from one who was not one of the Twelve, but their profane literary form. There was no precedent in the Old Testament for inspired letters. Irenaeus seems to be not so much concerned to understand and reproduce the teaching of S. Paul, as to be able to quote S. Paul's authority for his own teaching. It is the latter which determines what he shall quote from the writings of the Apostle rather than the writings which determine what he shall teach. This point brings us to the second part of the treatise.

Irenaeus is pronounced to be a theologian and not a philosopher. It is not an intelligible

theory of the universe, but a description of how God deals with men, and how they may attain to God, that he desires to give; and he appeals, not to speculation, but to experience. His end is not truth, but practical Christianity. He lacks the scientific conscience. Theology with him is not science, but apologetics; and its business is to supply external supports to what is established, rather than to find out and establish what is true. Irenaeus starts from a cut-and-dried system, which he desires to fortify with proofs; and therefore he quotes S. Paul's words, without proper apprehension of what they really imply. He has no idea how widely he differs from S. Paul, for he has no head for system and does not see that the same form of words may express very different ideas. But he is grand in his contention for a practical Christianity exhibited in a moral life. He is a lover, not of controversy, but of peace; and he is moved to attack heretics, because they disturb the peace of the Church, not because he is fond of polemics. Hence there is little of personal bitterness in his criticisms. He lived in a time of *Sturm und Drang*, and we must measure him by that rather than by the breadth and depth of the teaching of S. Paul.

But one is inclined to doubt whether the critic is not himself guilty of some of the narrowness with which he is disposed to tax Irenaeus. The amount of difference between Irenaeus and S. Paul is perhaps less than that between Irenaeus and Dr. Werner's interpretation of S. Paul. In any case it must be remembered that for us the teaching of the Apostle has been illuminated by the experience of eighteen centuries, and that of that illumination Irenaeus had experienced only the beginning.

A. PLUMMER.

A GREEK STORY OF ST. MICHAEL, EDITED BY MAX BONNET.

Narratio de miraculo a Michaelē Archangelo Chonis patrato, adjecto Symeonis Metaphrastae de eadem re libello. Edidit MAX BONNET. (pp. xlv. 36. Paris, Hachette et Cie.: 1890.) 3 francs.

THE name Chonae was applied, it would seem, to a suburb of Colossae which afterwards supplanted the mother-city, on account of the funnel-shaped chasm into which the river Chryses disappeared at that spot. The

phenomenon is common in the district, as in many other limestone regions, and is associated with a peculiar petrifying action of the waters. The popular tendency to explain remarkable natural or prehistoric features of a country by supernatural agencies, and the angelolatrous proclivities which prevailed in this region (Col. ii. 18), naturally explain the existence both of the story that the disappearance of the river at Chonae was the work of S. Michael, and of a shrine

or *ἐκτίριον* of the 'Archistrategus' at the spot. M. Bonnet has printed the Greek text of the narrative from several MSS. with an *apparatus criticus*, a thorough discussion of the problems offered by the history of the text, and excellent grammatical and other indices. He has also prefixed a very valuable dissertation on the origin and criticism of the narrative. The latter exists in three forms: an anonymous document, which Bonnet shows to be the source of the others; a narrative in a hortatory form bearing the name of Sisinnius (probably the patriarch of Constantinople 996—999 A.D.) and printed by the Bollandists (Sept. viii. 41 sqq.); and a recension by the Metaphrast, which Bonnet prints at the end of the present edition. The Greek menaea have summarised the tale, but it cannot be determined which document has been used.

The narrative as it stands is of literary, not of popular origin. The writer, in order to lead up to his subject, which requires some account of a miraculous spring, and a shrine beside it, borrows freely from the apocryphal acts of Philip, and perhaps in part from those of John. Finding that these Apostles came to Hierapolis, the author makes them, at a spot which he calls Chaeretopa, predict the miracle which he has to relate. This prediction, and the miraculous spring which issues forth as the memento of the apostolic visit, are the clumsy introduction to a pause of over ninety years after the death of the apostles, at the outset of which a converted heathen builds the *ἐκτίριον*. At the close of the ninety years, a certain Archippus (whose name is borrowed from Col. iv. 13, and clothed with purely conventional ascetic touches) becomes 'prosmonarius' or sacristan of the chapel. The heathen conspire to destroy the sacred spring by diverting the river to overwhelm it. Just as the dam is broken, and the flood is about to destroy the sanctuary and spring, Archippus, who has remained within in prayer, hears a great clap of thunder. The 'Archistrategus' Michael descends, rends the solid rock, promises that miraculous cures shall be wrought at the spot, and that the malicious conspirators shall be turned to stone, and finally bids the waters flow into the rent in

the rocks: ἀκοντίσθητε ὑμεῖς ἐν τῇ χώνη ταύτῃ καὶ ἔσπε χωνεύμενοι κ.τ.λ.

The remarkable thing is, that the name Chonae does not occur in the text. The scene of the apostolic prediction, and of the miracle itself, is 'Chaeretopa,' which M. Bonnet shows to have been quite a distinct place from Chonae or Colossae, and a spot marked by no such natural features as the narrative demands. The parting words of the Archangel are clearly meant to explain the name Chonae; and the mention of Chaeretopa must be set down to the topographical ignorance of the author, who perhaps, as M. Bonnet suggests, derived the name from the Acts of Philip. That the words which close the legend in the Basilian menology—καὶ ἐκλήθη ὁ τόπος ἔκτοτε Χῶναι—may have been taken from the now imperfect close of the narrative is possible, although if so the mutilation must have taken place at a very early date.

The date of composition falls not earlier than the fifth century; while the mention of heathen (not heretics) as the enemies of Archippus, and of the small shrine which had in later days given place to a sumptuous building, seems in favour of a date not much later. M. Bonnet leaves the date undetermined between the fifth and seventh centuries, but within these limits appears to incline to an earlier rather than a later date.

M. Bonnet has certainly imparted to the subject as much interest as it was capable of, and has brought out its points of contact with numerous questions of geography, history, and criticism. A better monograph on such a subject can scarcely be imagined; as the editor justly remarks, a book not likely to attract a second editor requires all the more thoroughness in what is likely to be a definitive edition.

M. Bonnet's Greek text and critical notes are an overprint from the *Analecta Bollandiana* viii. 287 sqq. The dissertation and indices are now added for the first time, and are a model of thoroughness and accuracy. Specially careful and scholarly is the eighth section 'de libris manu scriptis,' a thoroughly scientific exercise in textual criticism.

A. ROBERTSON.

AN INTERMEDIATE GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON.

An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon,
Founded upon the Seventh Edition of
Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon.
Oxford, 1889.

THIS lexicon is in the main an abridgment of the large edition, made by curtailing etymological matter and by omitting words and meanings of words which occur only in authors of late date and little read, as well as most citations of passages. The reduction in bulk thus effected amounts to nearly three-fourths of the original work. Thus we get a book which shares the great merits of its parent, and which, by reason of its superior lightness and compactness, is better adapted for beginners in the language and is at the same time a valuable accessory convenience for more advanced students. The assertion of the editor, Dean Liddell, that all words occurring in Greek literature down to the close of Classical Attic Greek have been inserted, seems to be, to all intents and purposes, exact, though one may observe the occasional omission of *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα*, as *ταλαντεία* (or *τανταλεία*), *ταλαντόμοι*, which occur in Plato, *τάραξις*, which occurs in Aristophanes, not to speak of words found only in the dramatic fragments. The needs of beginners have been consulted by the copious insertion of irregular verb-forms and crasis combinations, many of which do not appear in the unabridged edition.

In dealing with etymology, this abridgment has departed from the practice of the larger work in two particulars. In the first place the separation by a hyphen of the two parts of a compound word is carried out much more consistently, and where the second element of the compound is disguised a reference is more consistently inserted to the simple word from which the said element is regarded as derived. The other change is thus described by the editor, 'When the word represents the Root or Primitive Form with a termination easily separable, it is printed in Capital letters.' The attempt is one from which a scientific etymologist would shrink with dismay, but this surely might have been carried out with greater consistency than it has been. Thus we find 'ΕΗ' and the prepositions generally in capitals, but *κατά* and *ἐν* *ἐπ*; ΓΑΡ', but *γε*; ΑΝ, but *κε*; ΚΑΙ', but *τε*; ΔΕ', but *μέν*; ΕΙ', but *ἤ*. In the printing of verbs with modified present-stems, the confusion is

equally great. Thus we find KEY'ΘΩ, ΠΕΥ'ΘΩ, etc. but *τήκω*, *λείπω*; ΚΡΥ'ΙΤΩ, ΠΑ'Ι'ΙΤΩ, etc. but *ἄπτω*, *βάπτω*, etc.; ΘΑ'ΛΛΩ etc. but *βάλλω*, *σφάλλω*; ΑΥ'ΞΑ'ΝΩ etc. but *ἀμαρτάνω* etc.; ΠΕΤΑ'ΝΝΥΜΙ etc. but *κεράννυμι*; 'ΟΡΥ'ΣΣΩ, etc., but *πλήσσω* etc. In nouns we have *φυγή* etc. but ΤΥ'ΧΗ; in pronouns ΤΙΣ etc. but *Πός. Apart from these aberrations, the treatment of etymology in this abridgment seems to be generally judicious, silence being preferred to disputable explanations. But it is to be regretted that the astonishing statements prefixed, under the head of 'dialectic and other changes,' to each letter were not condensed out of existence. Possibly they are not to be regarded as scientific statements, but as clues for the recognition of identical words under different aspects. If so, it may well be doubted whether they are used for that purpose by anybody. Their removal would eliminate at a stroke a mass of error, without loss to the learner. In this connexion it may be mentioned that the epigraphical remarks on the signs Ε, Η, Ξ, Ο, Σ, are all more or less false or misleading.

Although this lexicon is professedly nothing more than an abridgment of the larger work, it has introduced, as was to be expected, a considerable number of corrections in matters of detail. In the hope of contributing something towards the improvement of the next edition I take this opportunity of pointing out some uncorrected errors which have fallen under my notice.

The political and legal terms generally need a thorough over-hauling. Thus under δῆμος III: 'in Attica....(in the time of Hdt.) 100 in number.' For the words in parenthesis substitute, 'as established by Kleisthenes.' The increase in the number of the demes may have taken place before Herodotus' time, as Köhler has shown.—στρατηγός II: 'at Athens, the title of ten officers...with the Polemarch at their head, Hdt. Thuc. etc.' The military functions of the Polemarch were lost early in the fifth century B.C. The account given under πολέμαρχος is correct.—καράστρατις: the signification in which this word is used in Lysias XVI., viz. allowance for equipment to one entering the cavalry force of Athens, is omitted, as also from the unabridged edition.—πρώταις II: 'at Athens. the πρώταις were a committee of 50, chosen by lot from each of the 10 φυλαί.' This does not say what was meant, as the context

shows. The *πρυτάνεις* at any given time were all of one *φυλή*.—*προεδρός* II.: 'in the Athenian *ἐκκλησία*, the *πρυτάνεις* in office were called *πρόεδροι*.' Quite wrong. The mistake is the more surprising, because the *Addenda* to the unabridged edition give s.v. *ἐπιστάτης* the correct statement, that the *πρόεδροι* belonged to the non-*πρυτανισing* tribes.—*γραφή* III.: 'as Att. law-term...a criminal prosecution undertaken by the state.' On the contrary, criminal prosecutions were generally undertaken by private citizens.—*συνήγορος* II.: 'at Athens public advocates, ten being appointed annually to represent the state.' *συνήγοροι* were in fact appointed only for special occasions.—*δικαστής*: 'at Athens...jurymen (the presiding judge being *ὁ κριτής*).' The presiding magistrate (not judge) was called *ἡγεμὼν δικαστηρίου*, never *κριτής*.

The following miscellaneous suggestions are arranged alphabetically. Where a reference is given in brackets, it is taken from the large edition, as the Intermediate Lexicon gives nothing more than names of authors. *ἀερός* II.: 'the pediment of a temple.' Add, 'or other building.'—*βαφή* IV.: 'in Soph. *Aj.* [651], *βαφή σίδηρος* ὥς must be construed not with *ἐθελύνθην*, but with the preceding words *καρτερὸς γένόμενος*, for iron becomes harder, not softer, by being dipped' [i.e. in cold water]. This is according to Professor Campbell's explanation. It might do, if Sophocles had really written *καρτερὸς γένόμενος*. What precedes is in fact *ἐκατέρων*. There is no difficulty in the rejected construction. Sophocles is thinking of the immersion of iron in hot oil, a process still in use for softening that metal. But the note is one which has no proper place in a lexicon such as this,—*βληχή*: 'the wailing of children,' Eur.' [*Cycl.* 48]. It is lambs, not children, that are spoken of.—*διαφόρητος*, which occurs in Eur. *Cycl.* 344, is omitted, as also from the large edition.—*δίκαιος* C.: 'in Prose, *δίκαιός εἰμι* with inf.' The con-

struction occurs in poetry also. Besides Ar. [*Neub.* 1434], actually referred to in the text I have noted Eur. *Hipp.* 1081, where, to be sure, the inf. is only understood.—*καθυβρίζω*: 'Pass., absol., to wax wanton,' Soph.' [*O.C.* 1535]. The form referred to is active.—*κάν*: 'κάν εἰ πολλοὶ...εἰσιν, for ὥσι Plat.' [*Meno.* 72, C]. Omit 'for ὥσι.' This slip is not in the unabridged edition.—*μετάστασις* II.; 'μ. ἡλίου, an eclipse,' Eur.' [*I.T.* 816]. The reference is to the sun's fabled change of course.—*ξеноφονέω*: 'to murder strangers,' Eur.' [*I.T.* 1021]. For 'strangers,' read 'one's host.'—*ὅτι* II. = *ὅ τι*, wherefore, *ὅτι τι*. If *ὅτι* meant wherefore, what would *τί* mean? In this combination, as elsewhere, *ὅτι*=*ὅτι*, because.—*παλεῶν*: 'to catch by decoy-birds,' Ar.' [*Av.* 1083, 1087]. For 'catch by' read 'act as.'—*πόριμος*: 'ἀπορα πόριμος, making possible the impossible,' Aesch.' [*Pr.* 905]. This neither makes sense nor can be got out of the words. Translate *fruitful in difficulties*, as Woolsey.—*ρήγνιν* or *-μιν*, ἵνος, ὅ. For ὅ read ἦ. The error is repeated from the unabridged edition, and appears also in Pape's *Handwörterbuch*.—*σύνδοδος* II.: 'κυνάειαι σύνδοδοι θαλάσσης [l. θαλάσσης], of the straits of the Hellespont,' Eur.' [*I.T.* 393]. For 'Hellespont' read 'Bosphorus.'—*σχολάζω* III. 2: 'σχ. τινί, to devote oneself to a master, attend his lectures,' Xen.' [*Symp.* 4, 44]. The phrase is *Σωκράτει σχολάζων συνδιημερεύειν*, where *Σωκράτει* depends on *σύν* and *σχολάζων* means *at leisure*, as the context shows beyond a doubt.—*τά*, 'neut. pl. of *ὁ*, *ῶ*, and *ὅς*.' Omit 'and *ὅς*.'—*τρίγλυφος*: 'the triglyph.... also *τρίγλυφον*, τό, Arist.' [*Eth.* N. 10, 4]. In the passage referred to, Aristotle uses τὸ *τρίγλυφον* of the frieze of the Doric order, as ἡ *τρίγλυφος* is used in line 30 of the inscription giving the plans and specifications for the naval arsenal of Philon (*Corp. Inscr. Att.* II. 1054).

F. B. TARBELL.

Harvard University.

H. D. MÜLLER ON THE INDO-GERMANIC VERB.

Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des indogermanischen Verbaubaus, von HEINRICH DIETRICH MÜLLER. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprechts Verlag, 1890. 4 Mk.

THIS work is an attempt to reinstate the science of philology in the position in which

it was left by Curtius. The theories of the junggrammatische Schule are abhorrent to Herr Müller; he will have none of them. The theory of nasal sonants is absolutely rejected (p. 114). Velar gutturals seem to escape unscathed; but against the view that the original language possessed three and

not one vowel he reasserts emphatically the old position. His argument on this point seems to have been drawn out more fully in his *Sprachgeschichtliche Studien*, published in 1884, but it is summarised on p. 97 *sqq.* of the present pamphlet. The position is as follows. The fact that in the present participle, a formation of universal occurrence, Greek has *-ovr-*, Latin *-ent-*, but Sanskrit and all other languages *-ant-* is in itself strong presumptive evidence that *a* was the vowel of the original speech. The theory of a nasal sonant and an ablaut of inflexion is passed over unnoticed. For the existence of an original *o* he declares with Curtius that there is absolutely no evidence. We might reply in his own words that the fact that while Sanskrit, Zend, and to some extent German, have *a*, Greek, Latin, Armenian, Celtic, Balto-Slavonic (to some extent) and German (in the case of the long vowel) have *o* is on the principle of counting heads strong presumptive evidence that *o* was a vowel of the original speech. His explanation of the passage of an original *a* to European *e* is remarkable. It began, it would appear, in unaccented syllables, *bhāratī* becoming *bhāretī*. Such an alteration of the vowel in an unaccented syllable in Greek is hard to believe, and indeed Herr Müller only supports it by an appeal to German and at the expense of ignoring the difference between the musical and the expiratory accent. *bhāretī* then passes into *bhēretī* by 'regressive assimilation' of the *a* to the following *e*; a theory which is again supported by an appeal to the German umlaut. *ἀγεία* does not become **ἐγεία*, because as a verb of the sixth class it was originally accented after the root (*agāti*), or, as Müller would say, on the second syllable of the root, and regressive assimilation is only possible in the case of an accented vowel.

The author's views as to the development of language are peculiar. All language begins with the pronominal roots, from which are developed the adverbs. The simplest sentence is of the type *πάρα δ' ἀνίπ*. From these roots are developed nouns and verbs, the only difference between the two being the presence or absence of endings of person, mood and tense. The suffixes that elevate the pronominal root into a verb are the same as those that elevate it into a noun. The suffix *na* of the verbal adjective in Sanskrit and Greek is the same as the *na* of the Gothic passive. The *ya* of present stems of the fourth class is the same as the *ya* that forms adjectives of the type *ἀγίος*—and so on. In fact there is a river at Macedon

and a river at Monmouth. The verbal stem *bhara* is derived from a pronominal root meaning 'upwards' (cf. Germ. *em-por*). Conceived as an adjective *bhara* means 'high,' *bhara-mi* 'high I.' *bhara-mi* may be understood either of a *status motivus* or a *status quietivus* and signify either 'I become high' or 'I am high.' With an accusative it means 'hoch ich den Stein,' that is either 'ich hebe den Stein empor' (*status motivus*) or 'ich halte den Stein empor' (*status quietivus*). The long *a* in *bhārami* is explained (p. 15) as originating in the time when the suffix *mi* was not yet added, and as being merely a method of protecting the final short vowel in *bhara* from disappearing, which it seems it must otherwise have done. The same explanation applies to *ἀνὸ* beside *ἀν*. The same service of protecting a disappearing vowel may be performed by certain consonants (*s, m, n, t, d*), which then have a purely phonetic value.

In a book which departs so entirely from the now accepted tradition we naturally look to see whether any light is thrown by the galvanisation of the old method of the school of Bopp on such cruxes as the Greek perfect in *-κα* or the Latin perfect in *-vi*. For the perfect in *-κα* Müller rejects, no doubt rightly, the theories both of Osthoff and of Brugmann. His own theory is as follows. A suffix of some kind being required to distinguish the perfect forms more clearly, the Greeks would naturally have employed *-va*, the suffix of the perfect participle: but being apparently aware that in the natural course of things an intervocalic *f* would ultimately disappear, they rejected this method and employed instead the suffix *-ka*, which appears in Lat *cum* (with final protecting nasal), in Sanskrit forms like *nartaka*, and in *medicus*, *γραφικός*, *capax*, etc. The original meaning of *ka* was 'with,' and the idea of accompaniment is well adapted to give the required present meaning of the tense. Latin on the other hand, in which an intervocalic *v* would not have dropped out, forms its perfect with the suffix *va*, which has the same meaning of accompaniment, and the final long *i* of the first person is due only to the lengthening which is elsewhere found in final syllables.

It is no doubt well that we should not hold the laws of any science merely as a matter of tradition; and above all in Comparative Philology there is a danger lest principles should come to be accepted unquestioningly merely on the strength of the great names with which their discovery is associated. A real service may be done

to the science by an attack on the foundations of the accepted creed, if only because it enables those foundations to be established more securely. And a doctrine when it becomes traditional often gathers round it an accretion of other matter which overlays or sometimes distorts the truth that the doctrine originally asserted. The statement for example of Grimm's Law, as given in the popular handbooks of to-day, generally shows that the exact point which Grimm proved is entirely misconceived. And so it is not desirable that the philologist of the future should become acquainted with the theory of nasal sonants only through the medium of the *Grundriss*, and should never have read Brugmann's original paper on the *nasalis sonans*. But we cannot think that Herr Müller's attack seriously invalidates the truth of the theories of the scholars who are still, though rather inappropriately, known as the Junggrammatiker. The test of the value of an hypothesis is solely its power to explain the facts, and it is obvious that no detailed defence of the position is possible within the limits of a review. But while for the destructive part of this pamphlet we can only refer to such an accumulation of instances as are to be found in Brugmann's *Grundriss*, we may perhaps be allowed to enter a protest against the method of the constructive part. All that is written on what the Germans call glottogenic problems is written in water. In England, so far as original work in philology has been attempted, the common sense of scholars has kept them off the dangerous ground. But in Germany such questions seem to have an increasing

attraction, and even Brugmann's second volume is not free from traces of rather wild conjecture in this province. No doubt *i* appears in the suffix of *βάλλω* and equally in the suffix of *ἄγιος*. We may note the fact as of possible importance; but to go further and say that the significance of *i* in both cases is the same and then to cast about for some vague and comprehensive meaning which will cover its usage as a verbal and as a nominal suffix is to open the way for the most baseless conjecture. It is plain that any two scholars might with equal probability assign different and even directly opposite significations. So long as we are dealing merely with the question of phonetic change within a word or sentence we can check our results and scientific generalisations are possible; but when we attempt to analyse a word into its component parts and assign a specific meaning to each element, we are inquiring into that which in the present state of our knowledge it cannot be given us to know. If in Comparative Syntax we find scholars at variance on so comparatively simple a question as the original meaning of the optative mood, where after all the possible meanings are very few in number, what may we expect to find in the case of formative suffixes, where the possible meanings are almost indefinite? On the whole we cannot but regret that so distinguished a scholar as Herr Müller should have wasted so much misdirected ingenuity and learning in the attempt to bring the science back again to the position that it occupied at the time of Bopp.

CHR. COOKSON.

THE ANCIENT CLASSICAL DRAMA.

The Ancient Classical Drama: A Study in Literary Evolution. By R. G. MOULTON, M.A. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 8s. 6d.

THIS volume contains a course of Extension Lectures delivered by Mr. Moulton in the North of England. His views on the subject of classical education may be gathered from the following extracts from his admirable preface: 'Whatever may be the intention of those who direct our higher education, I believe that our study of Latin and Greek is in practice almost exclusively a study of language: the great mass of those receiving a classical education enter upon life with no

knowledge of literature or taste for it': 'the language element of classics almost entirely swallows up the element of literature': 'thus classics to the ordinary student is a study terribly out of perspective, demanding exactness in minor points, yet admitting vagueness in all that is great.' The evil, it is to be feared, is a growing one, and a welcome should be given to any book which tends to counteract it. Mr. Moulton's book is in very many ways calculated to do so, though it must be admitted that his treatment of the subject is not always likely to foster literary interest: its defects seem due partly to the circumstances of its composi-

tion, partly to the method adopted. Clearness of exposition is no doubt necessary in addressing classes of unskilled hearers: in the present book the blackboard and the chalk, which are so helpful in the lecture-room, seem to loom before one again and again in the diagrams and tables of dramatic motives, of choral odes and the like, which constantly occur: the somewhat rhetorical paraphrases of illustrative passages, often disproportionately long, are rather of the nature of recitation than necessary literary analysis, and, though probably effective before an audience somewhat sated with schemes and diagrams, cause a feeling of weariness in the reader. More serious defects may be traced to the method employed. Mr. Moulton seems to have been led away into the endeavour to classify and provide with formulae everything which comes within reach: to explain everything as the result either of a law or of some modifying sub-law. The imagination of genius is surely the one thing which should be exempted from the hunter of specimens and affixer of labels: the broad principles of dramatic evolution may be traced, and general laws laid down, with tolerable certainty and general edification: but when we read a tabulated list of dramatic motives, which, beginning with destiny and horror, end with subdivisions such as geography and celibacy, one is tempted to ask whether literary analysis is not being carried a little too far. At the same time much of what Mr. Moulton has to say on these topics is true and interesting enough, but would be better placed in a chapter of general observations. Again, after some admirable remarks on the chorus as the conservators of the 'unities,' and on the tendency of religious associations, by limiting the choice of subjects to well known stories, to eliminate 'surprise' from dramatic effects, Mr. Moulton gives us a long classification of plots, the practical value of which it is hard to see, culminating in a note, where we find different varieties of plots denoted by symbols such as S + S', CR. The latter is the notation of the *Philoctetes*.

(The formula for the *Phormio* is $\frac{CR}{C} = R$.)

The list of Aristophanes' varieties of wit is even more distressing. In the same way one may object to Mr. Moulton's classification of choral odes. This is five-fold, and an English reader would be apt to suppose that every ode was a single poem falling under one or other of the proposed heads. The fact that so many choral odes are composite makes such a hard and fast classifica-

tion impossible and misleading. Thus far the defects of Mr. Moulton's book seem to have arisen from a too close application of a rigid scientific system to a necessarily elastic body of material: but there is another and an important point of a different nature, on which many will disagree with Mr. Moulton. He has regarded Aeschylus Sophocles and Euripides as forming so to say a single group, and quotes indiscriminately from them, when considering the position and nature of Athenian drama. This appears inconsistent with Mr. Moulton's professed object and method. If 'choral tragedy,' to adopt Mr. Moulton's own term, is the species with which we are concerned, any development which affects the chorus is pertinent. Now the position assumed by the chorus in the earlier plays of Aeschylus differs entirely from that which is assigned to it by Euripides. These changes too were organic and of the true nature of development, which cannot be said of the modifications of the chorus found for instance in the borrowed and artificial drama of Seneca. Hence to treat the choral odes of the three dramatists as illustrating the same period of evolution is but to obscure the main lines of change. Surely it would have been better had Mr. Moulton clearly traced the gradual alteration in the character of the chorus, instead of relegating all notice of it to a section dealing with 'transition influences.' Similarly, when Mr. Moulton is treating of destiny as a dramatic motive, by quoting from the three tragedians without noticing the change of view which separates Aeschylus from Euripides, he involves an already obscure subject in greater obscurity than ever. Where however the nature of the matter admits of strict analysis, Mr. Moulton's book is admirable. He shows well the origin and development of tragedy, marking the lyric and epic elements which enter into it, while to the English reader his treatment of the Lycurgus story in illustration of the points of view of Attic tragedy is most instructive, as also is his abstract of the *Oresteia*. Many useful remarks will be found in the chapter on 'Ancient Tragedy in Transition,' where, though nothing new is brought forward, the case is well and thoughtfully stated. Mr. Moulton's somewhat mechanical method of criticism finds free range in the sections which deal with variations of metre: they would have been at any rate more interesting, had he been satisfied with laying down some general rules, with typical examples. A few illustrations like Browning's translation from

the *Herakles* (quoted by Mr. Moulton) would do far more to show the real power of metrical change than the somewhat artificial and fanciful exposition of long passages from Sophocles or Aristophanes.

In spite of the drawbacks mentioned above, Mr. Moulton's book is interesting and valuable, and is, it is to be trusted, the

precursor of others which may tend to rescue Latin and Greek from becoming a mere examination-area, and an exercise-ground for gloss-hunters and *kai*-counters.

'A life of merchandise' seems a curious expression. What is the authority for 'entre'-acte' (repeated four times)?

W. S. HADLEY.

ERDMANN'S HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY.

Erdmann's History of Philosophy. English translation. Edited by WILLISTON H. HOUGH, Ph.M. In Three Volumes. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co. New York: Macmillan & Co. £2 2s.

THE translation of Erdmann's *History of Philosophy* was a work worth doing, and the laborious task has been accomplished by Professor Hough and his coadjutors well enough for all practical purposes. We are not likely soon to have an independent history of philosophy from an English scholar, and the history of Erdmann if not the best is at any rate the best tolerably readable and continuous exposition that can be used to supplement the unreadable but indispensable Ueberweg. Erdmann has some grave defects. He is an Hegelian prepared to step in and prove to you in advance of each successive system that it has swallowed (*aufgehoben*!) and therefore surpasses its predecessors which 'did not understand themselves,' and that 'es muss so sein' because it was demanded by the *Zeitgeist*. When strongly moved he is capable of uttering oracles like that which his present *ἱστορίης* interprets to this result: 'Science is, therefore, comprehended history, the Recollection and the Calvary of the absolute Spirit, to which only out of the cup of this realm of Spirits mantles its infinity.'

These dithyrambs however occur rarely outside of the chapters devoted to the successors of Kant, and the *a priori* construction of the course of philosophic evolution exercises little influence on the exposition, except in the case of the pre-Socratics who have always been regarded as legitimate themes for clever combinations. The taste of some readers will be gratified by finding prefixed to each system a prophecy after the fact in the shape of a demonstration of its world-historic necessity in its time and place. They will have a sense of profound insight

as they read that the Ionic hylozoism was to be looked for in colonies, or that 'because the times had become Roman' (had they then?) Aristotle and Plato had to be replaced by the Stoics and Epicureans. Other readers may simply omit these sections.

A more serious defect is the want of that conscientious erudition that German science boasts as her chief honour, and that gives the unphilosophical history of Zeller its unquestioned supremacy. I do not refer to Erdmann's neglect of bibliography and of what his compatriots by a notable *lucus a non* designate as the 'Literatur' of the subject. It is a waste of paper to reprint Ueberweg-Heinze with every new exposition of the subject, and I cannot admit the natural right to a notice of every dissertation- and program-writer. But a reader who is prepared to work through two thousand pages on the history of philosophy may fairly demand exact controlling references to the original sources. And when Erdmann asserts in his preface that he has found with his own eyes all that he makes the philosophers say we can only ask for example whether he found ἀφύσικοι (Vol I. p. 40) in the text of Aristotle, whether εἰσοπεποιημένον (p. 21) occurs in the text of Anaximander or in that of his interpreter, and where in the context of *Parmenides* 156 D he found the Christian conception of 'the union of rest and motion, enjoyment and labour' which Plato 'had beheld only in a passing flash.'

These defects however are made good by one great merit. It is Erdmann's habit, wherever it is possible, to expound a system by means of a clear straightforward *résumé* of the chief literary work in which it is set forth. These *résumés* are executed intelligently and in the main accurately, and thus the student instead of losing himself in a maze of abstractions relating to men and doctrines of which he knows nothing is brought face to face with the only realities

touched by the history of philosophy—the writings of the great philosophers. This method is not everywhere applicable, notably not in the sections devoted to ancient philosophy which are for the most part based on the excerpts in Ritter and Preller. But in the chapters on modern philosophy from Descartes to Kant it yields admirable results. These five hundred pages (which are well translated) might well be published separately as a text-book of modern philosophy. They would find many readers who take no interest in the scholasticism of the middle ages or of the post-Kantians, and who would desire more authentic accounts of ancient philosophy than can be found in the first volume.

The translation is in the main correct and fairly readable. 'Gruppe's attempt to vindicate Plato's far more developed astronomical conceptions' (§ 78,4) hardly represents the 'Plato viel ausgebildete astronomische Vorstellungen zu vindiciren' of the original, and Plato's *σασσιῶται τοῦ ὅλου* after transference from Greek to German and German to English are hardly recognizable as the 'all-consolidators.' The philosophic terminology has been doubtless much benefited by the revision of the editor, but perfect consistency and accuracy have by no means been attained. The words *Anschauung*, *Vorstellung* and their paronyms present the chief difficulties. It is probably safer to render *Anschauung* everywhere by 'intuition,' *Vorstellung* generally by 'presentation,' and

vorstellbar by 'picturable or, rarely, 'thinkable.' But in the present work the Hegelian misuse of *Vorstellung* in antithesis now to *Begriff* and now *Idee* makes the translator's task very difficult. Where Greek terms which have not yet become technical, as *αἰσθησις*, *δόξα*, *νοῦς*, etc., find their way into English through translation of their supposed German equivalents, the confusion becomes hopeless. Compare page 113 where *vorstellbar* representing presumably the Platonic *δοξαστόν* is translated 'capable only of being imagined'; page 118 where *Anschaulich* is rendered 'clear to perception' but means rather 'picturable in imagination'; p. 134 where the student would certainly be misled by finding 'theoretical understanding' glossed by *τέχνη*; and page 183 where among several other confusing statements we have an identification of *ὁρθὴ δόξα* with *ὑπόληψις*. On page 143 we read that Aristotle calls rhetoric the complement of dialectic. *Gegenstück* here represents Aristotle's *ἀντίτροφος* and should be rendered 'counterpart.' Misprints and careless accents, though by no means wanting, are not sufficiently numerous to impair the value of the book. I note among others *ἀφθαρόν* (p. 22), *δοφία* (p. 109), *μονογένης* (p. 116), *φύλαι* (p. 124), *τύπῳσις* for *τύποισις* (p. 187). The chapters from Kant to Hegel are an exception to the general excellence of the translation. Vol. II. p. 361, for example, is a literary curiosity.

PAUL SHOREY.

ROHDE'S PSYCHE.

Psyche. Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen. Von ERWIN ROHDE. Erste Hälfte. Freiburg-i.-B. 1890. Akademische Verlagbuchhandlung von J. C. B. Mohr. 7 Mk.

THIS monograph has a value for mythologists beyond its avowed intention. In his examination of the belief of the Greeks as to the future state of the soul and the ritual practices founded on it, Herr Rohde starts from the Homeric poems, but he is well aware—and this constitutes the peculiar value of his monograph—that the Homeric poems are in reality for mythology no starting-point, but a poetic break, a fault—if we may borrow the metaphor—in the regular stratification of autochthonous tradition. So long as the mythologist insists on beginning with the

poetic and ultimately orthodox Olympian system, so long will he work with the cart before the horse and any intelligible sequence be impossible. No better instance of this could be found than this question of the belief in the after state of the soul, and it is in his clear recognition of the principle of the Homeric break, rather than in any special novelty of either fact or theory, that Herr Rohde claims our gratitude. We have only to regret that he tells his story at such needless length and with such tedious iteration.

The gist of his contention is this. Homer (taking Homer for epic tradition generally) believes that *something* persists after death: that something is no more life, though it is called *Psyche*; rather it is the very opposite of life, it is the shadowy double of a man deprived of all the charac-

teristics of life. This something, *as soon as the body is burnt*, goes away to a place apart, remote, from which there is no possibility of return. Further, this something, once gone to Hades, has no power for good or for evil on the living. In a word the Homeric world is haunted by no ghosts—Patroklos himself, once his body burnt, can reappear no more: hence after the funeral there is no cultus of the dead, no offerings at the tomb, no oracular utterance: all is done. In this respect Homeric faith is markedly different from that of most primitive peoples. Usually the dead man's ghost haunts his tomb, is locally powerful, must be tended and appeased. Moreover, in post-Homeric times we find an elaborate cultus of the dead, hero-worship, and the whole apparatus of a faith that recognises the power of the departed soul. Whence and when did this arise? Herr Rohde contends, and we believe rightly, that this faith and this ritual existed before Homer, and that in his poems there are traces of its survival; that during the period of epic influence it slept for a time, and re-awakened to fresh power and new developments: he believes, in fact, in the *epic break* in tradition. The break he abundantly proves: the reason is harder to determine. He conjectures—but all here is conjecture—that the reason for this break in traditional faith is to be sought in the general tribal upheaval consequent on the Doric invasion and the movement of the displaced tribes towards the coast of Asia. In a word, when you are moving about from place to place, when conditions almost nomadic compel you to burn your dead, you tend to drop a cultus that is local and ancestral; your gods, we may add, tend to remove themselves from their tribal seats and collect into a remote Olympus equally convenient at all points and always remote; your dead, instead of hovering about their ancestral graves, go to a common Hades, and revisit you no more, uncertain where you

are. But when you settle again, rebuilding home and hearth, the old local ancestral faith and ritual revive.

To the existence of the Homeric break Hesiod gives incidental and most interesting testimony. His five ages are characterised not more by their moral standard than by their status after death. One after the other they follow in regular decadence, with but one break in their continuity, and that for the epic heroes. The golden race after death are happy daimons, guardians of men: the remotest tradition then known to Hesiod shows a belief in the *activity* and *local* presence of souls after death. The men of the silver race, disobedient to Zeus, buried in the earth, but still were powerful and worshipped after death. The iron race went down to Hades nameless. The fourth race, the heroes of Thebes and Troy, interrupt the downward sequence—a part of them 'death covered,' and they reappeared no more; a few, the exception always, Zeus kept alive, they never suffered death, but they were translated to remote regions, islands of the blessed. This is perfectly consistent with Homeric faith—if you die, you end; if you are favoured by the gods, you are translated. After this break the downward sequence goes on uninterrupted.

We have no space to note in detail the many interesting points dealt with in relation to this main contention, *e.g.* the gradual modification of the original Homeric view as seen in the later 'descent of Odysseus into Hades' and the other cyclic poems, the exceptional criminals like Sisyphos and Tantalos, hero-worship, cave oracle gods, ritual of the dead, chthonic deities, and especially the Eleusinian cults: everywhere the absence of any doctrine of moral retribution in primitive Greek faith is clearly demonstrated. The present monograph, it should be noted, is only a first part.

JANE HARRISON.

Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Ilias. Von HERMANN KLUGE. Cöthen. Schulze, 1889. Pp. viii., 200. 8vo. Mk. 4. 50.

This little book is an attempt to analyze the *Iliad*, and to determine the relative age of the different portions, by a study of the metre. The first part aims to discover the origin of the Homeric hexameter, and to ascertain the characteristics of its earlier forms. Previous theories are summarily set aside. In the first chapter the author endeavours to show that the original foot was the spondee. The constant increase in the percentage of dactyls in demonstrably later epic poems points to this conclusion; in the *Odyssey*

the dactyls are $2\frac{3}{4}$ as many as the spondees; in Apollonius of Rhodes the figure becomes $3\frac{3}{4}$, after a steady increase in intervening writers. The author's second contention is that the original metrical principle is the accent of recurring syllables. The lengthening of short vowels is very common, and cannot otherwise be accounted for. The shortening of long syllables (as in B 537, I 382); the insertion of particles like γ' , β' , τ' , often in a succession of lines (A 671—715, Φ 489); synizesis (as in A 273) and other similar devices resorted to, for the purpose of making the verse fit the type, show—says our author—that the original type was not quantitative but accentual.

It is further claimed that the original form of the verse was either that of two tripodies, or that of three dipodies. Each of these two forms gave rise to a hexameter in different places, and from the fusion of these hexameters is descended the present form. Anacrusis and catalexis were common; hence a dactyl containing the caesura would arise in the third foot of the first type of hexameter, and in the second and fourth feet of the second type. Survivals of such an anacrusis may still be noted, as in O 18, and Φ 396. Finally, the author attempts to show that rhyme is a common feature of the older verses, and that we must therefore assume it for the original form: this rhyme is either of hexameters, of dipodies, or of tripodies, and this fact in respect to dipodies and tripodies is adduced as evidence of the two-fold origin of the hexameter. The chapters on the development of the present metre from these elements are less important.

These assumptions give rise to a few questions which Kluge has not satisfactorily answered: If rhyme were general, why should it have become as uncommon as even the author admits? Is not the periodical repetition of similar sounds more simply explained as merely rhetorical, and are we justified in finding in it, occurring so sporadically, evidence as to the original length of the verse? If the second, third and fourth feet are the ones in which on this theory the dactyl most naturally arose, how does it happen that as a fact the fifth foot is the favourite place for them? Passing by the artificial explanation of the origin of quantitative scansion, why should the spondee be assumed as the original foot rather than the dactyl? It is the characteristic of early and ruder poetry to be rhythmic without too much regard to the number of syllables; is the Greek epic alone to be an exception, and is it reasonable to ascribe to it such an artificial principle of rhythm as that here described? It would be more simple to assume that both feet, dactyl and spondee, are crystallizations from an early freer movement, in which the longer syllable naturally attracted the recurring accent. The freer, less artificial is not descended from the more artificial; precision and the regulation of liberty come with the growth of poetry. It is true that the hexameter naturally falls asunder into two or three parts, but this is no proof that these are distinct elements in origin.

The second part of the book gives the percentage of verses of the older and of the later form in each section of the *Iliad*, and endeavours to establish the relative dates of these sections on this basis: thus the oldest passages are A 521—574, M 41—85, 252—289 and, with some short passages in N O, constitute an Older Wrath. Other short sections here and there are scattered bits of older work. The wrath of Achilles is treated also in a Later Wrath, and the two lays on this subject are worked together with additions at different points, made at various periods. The author's statistics have a value independent of that of the theory based upon them; they show clearly certain metrical peculiarities in different sections of the *Iliad*, and the metrical relation of these sections to each other.

ARTHUR FAIRBANKS,
N. Y.

Homeric Grammar for Upper Forms of Schools.

By F. E. THOMPSON. Rivingtons: 1890. 2s. 6d.

If this book did not contain an advertisement of two other works 'by the same author,' the reader would set it down as by a novice in book-making. On almost every page appear marks of inexperience or of haste. The heading 'Homeric Prosody' (probably

for 'Homeric Grammar') stands on every left-hand page of the book, while the headings on the right-hand page are not systematic. The main faults of the book are negative rather than positive. It fails to distinguish sufficiently between what is important and what is exceptional, and thus our old friend, the passive-ending *-μεθον* appears simply as 'rare.' But the author has an entirely wrong view of the Homeric dialect and even tries to explain 'the development of Epic into Attic!' See pp. viii., 1, 126. When he says that in *Ἰδδαίον* 'a vowel has probably been lost,' he doubtless means that a consonant has been lost: but he may not have been clear in his mind, for he says on p. 11 that 'the group *δέος* [where 'δ' appears to stand for δF] is more difficult of discussion.' The material is ill digested. On p. 20 the same note is given in two recensions; cf. on p. 26, 'But, N.B., in some cases the true ending appears to be -oo, and we should write *Ἰαλοο*', etc., and below 'The metre often requires -oo as with *Ἰαλοο* above'—as if the metre were not the only indication for the forms *Ἰαλοο* and *ῥο*. Lack of mental digestion is seen in § 11, where 'Caesura,' 'Diaeresis,' 'Hiatus,' and 'Elision' are brought into one article. The definitions are not always happy; as, p. 15, 'Hiatus is the gap produced by non-elision,' and, p. 14, 'Apocope is the cutting off of a short final syllable.' The paragraph on 'prodelision' might have been omitted, since the only example given seems to be not Homeric. The English expression is often careless, as, p. 20, 'Diphthongs can be shortened in Homer as in Iambics before a vowel following it [sic] in the same word.' The proof-reading has been carelessly done. The author has trusted too much to the printer, who has well done his part in making a comely book, but one that will not bear inspection.

—Y.

Die Sprichwörter bei den Römischen Komikern. Von WILHELM VON WYSS, Dr. Phil. Zurich, 1889. Pp. 111. 2 Mk.

A COLLECTION of proverbs and proverbial sayings from PL. (including the fragments), from Ter. and Ribbeck's *Fragmenta*. It appears to be very complete, and the proverbs are well grouped according to their sources rather than according to their application. The headings in the Table of Contents—Mythological, historical and geographical proverbs, Proverbs from public life, Nature in proverbs, etc.—with a sufficient number of sub-classes, enable one to use the book for reference, and take the place of an index. The author has used the work of his predecessors, Schneider, Pflügl, Wortmann and especially Otto in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, iii. iv. v. and has contributed something to the subject by careful use of the collections of Greek proverbs.

But when this is said, all is said. No general principles are laid down to distinguish a proverb from a metaphor which has become idiomatic; *tragulam inicere* is included (p. 32), but not *ballistam intendere*, or *oblinere* (p. 67), but not *dare verba*. No line is drawn between proverbs clearly taken from the Greek and those which bear merely an accidental resemblance to Greek sayings. No real help to the understanding of difficult passages is given. P. 79, there is no distinction between *uigilans dormiat* and *uigilans somniat*; p. 90, the uses of *cuculus* are given but the wide differences in application are unnoticed; p. 83, *Simia* so called because he was as ugly as a monkey; p. 73, *Pseud.* 1196, *quem hominem nullius coloris noui*, p. 78, *Pseud.* 318 f., etc., etc., are illustrations of difficulties passed over too lightly. Other explanations are either from editions which are in

everybody's hands (Brix, Lorenz), or are unnecessary.

The two conclusions reached are 'dass auch auf diesem Gebiete die Römer nur die Schüler und Nachahmer der Griechen waren,' and that Plautus has more proverbs than Terence, a fact which the author attributes in part to his greater originality. That these two results directly contradict one another the author does not observe; the former is incorrect and the error comes from a failure to sift the material with sufficient care.

E. P. MORRIS,
Williams College.

De Manili qui fertur Astronomicis. Inest de imperatoribus Romanis in siderum numerum relatis disputatio. Scriptis AUGUSTUS KRAEMER, Wilinaburgiensiis. Marburgi: 1890.

THIS dissertation is to some extent inspired by Birt, and is not unworthy of that eminent scholar, whose pupil its author professes himself in the *vita* appended at the end of the work. The subject shows that the interest of scholars in Manilius' poem is gradually reawaking, and the dissertation deserves to be read if only for this; but it is also good in itself, carefully considered, and nowhere exaggerated or overstated.

The writer aims to prove that all the five books of the *Astronomica* were written before the death of Augustus. This involves an examination of some of the counter-arguments of Freier (Gottingen 1880), who had tried to show that they belong to a later date, the principate of Tiberius. Krämer succeeds, I think, in establishing that some of his opponent's arguments are wire-drawn and unnatural; and that the earlier date is more consonant with the language not only of Manilius but his contemporaries. As is usual with Germans, Krämer has an exaggerated opinion of Bentley, and thinks it necessary to enter into a long discussion (of a very unconvincing kind) to prove that *modo* in I. 898 cannot well mean anything but what Scaliger explained it to mean—*non multo ante*. The pages directed to this examination are the only part of the dissertation which must be pronounced weak. It is pleasing to see that Prof. Jebb's *Life of Bentley* has been studied (in a German translation).

The discussion on the deification of Augustus during his life-time brings together a variety of passages which seem to prove the point. But whether Augustus was worshipped as the sun, whether the much-debated *proles Iulia descendit caelo caelumque replevit* can refer to the young Caesars, Gaius and Lucius, whether so very harsh a construction as results from making the sentence terminate with the word *Iulia*, and marking off the following words from *descendit* to *tangunt* 804 as a separate and quasi-parenthetical clause is at all possible—these are points on which judgment must necessarily be reserved.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

Inscriptions Antique de la Côte-d'Or. Par PAUL LEJAY Paris: Bouillon (Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes Études, fasc. 80), pp. 281. 8vo. 1889.

THIS pamphlet is a timely addition to our knowledge of the Roman inscriptions found in France. For one reason or another, very little has yet been done towards collecting these inscriptions. *Gallia Narbonensis* has, indeed, been exhaustively dealt with by Hirschfeld in the twelfth volume of the Berlin *Corpus*, but for the larger part of France the student has less accessible aids than for any other of the lands which formed part of the Roman Empire. Any collected edition is therefore useful, even if, like the present volume, it includes only 300 inscriptions (including

pottery), and deals with a district which was partly in Gaul, partly in upper Germany. The general idea of the district which one can get from the present collection is that its civilization was not of a particularly high order. A very large proportion of the inscriptions are funeral monuments which, to judge by the formulae used, are seldom earlier than the third century and often of very much later date. The whole number of inscriptions is small, and few, even of those found in Dijon, are important. There is, indeed, one remarkable set of tiles found at Mirebeau in the country of the Lingones, which apparently belongs to the revolt of Civilis, and which deserves more notice from editors of Tacitus' *Histories* than it has received in spite of Mommsen's article on it (in *Hermes* xix. 437 foll.). On the whole, the contrast is very strong between these inscriptions and those of (say) *Gallia Narbonensis*. One is reminded rather of the British inscriptions—only the latter include a number of important military records which are unknown in the Côte-d'Or. It remains only to say that the execution of the work is satisfactory. How far the author has exhausted the local literature of the subject I cannot pretend to judge, but the general character of his work is careful, and without suggesting originality, certainly inspires confidence. An additional value is given to the work by the fact that the author has himself collated a large number of texts, though he does not seem to have made many serious corrections. The chief fault of the book is a certain verbosity which may possibly be justified in a work of this character—as it would be in the local journals of archaeology in England—but which is very unlike the lucid brevity of the *Corpus* and of treatises written on the same lines as the *Corpus*. The book is well indexed, but maps of the district and of Dijon would be useful. It is to be hoped that the success of the present volume may induce those responsible for the series in which it appears to induce other students to collect and edit the inscriptions of other departments. We should thus obtain a survey of lapidary texts which, apart from their local interest, would fill up an awkward gap during the interval—probably a long one—required for the completion of the volumes of the *Corpus* which will deal with *Gallia Comata*.

F. HAVERFIELD.

Models and Exercises in Unseen Translation.

By H. F. FOX, M.A., and Rev. T. H. BROMLEY, M.A. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1890. 5s. 6d.

THIS is a book of over 400 pp., of which 82 pp. (Part I.) consist of prose and verse extracts from Greek and Latin classical authors, with idiomatic translations on the opposite side; and the rest of the book of similar extracts without translations. There are no notes; nor are there any references to the source of the extracts or any table of contents; the two latter might be added with advantage in a second edition. The extracts seem well selected and of the right length. Part I., containing 32 translations by such well known scholars as Jowett, Sidgwick, Myers, Bradley and others, will be found especially useful, in supplying not only models of translation but examples of differences of idiom for Greek and Latin composition; e.g. passages like these, 'The desire to become familiar with the names of the great actors in the world's drama, with their parentage and nationality' (*cum volumus nomina eorum qui quid gesserint nota nobis esse parentes patriam*), or 'The policy of expediency, the patriotic policy was so far identical with morality that it ought to have commanded the assent even of Collatinus himself' (*quod erat utile, patriae consulere, id erat ita honestum ut etiam ipsi*

Collatino placere deberet) will serve as useful helps for teachers in deducing general rules. It may be doubted however whether the compilers have made up their minds as to what amount or kind of freedom should be encouraged in translation, for the styles of many passages [cf. i. iv. and xxx., or xxiii. xxv. and xxvii] are totally different. It is hard to conceive a scholar retranslating the following 'Well may my pen have lost its cunning and my voice be unused to break silence, but even so will I assay,' etc. by Tacitus' *'non tamen pigebit vel incondita ac rudi voce,'* etc. Unfortunately there is no agreement among scholars as to what should be aimed at or what principles observed in translating. Some try to show accuracy of scholarship at the expense of their English, some to show their knowledge of differences of idiom by reproducing the sense of all authors alike, however simple and unaffected, in the verbose well-rounded antithetical phraseology of the present age, often with the sacrifice of point and emphasis as well as of accuracy: others, though fewer, vary their style strictly according to their author's, and are content with sound, simple, idiomatic English even if sometimes quaint and irregular. Instances of all these three styles will be found in this book, and if carefully analyzed by the teacher to his class will be found very useful: otherwise they may prove perplexing.

J. E. NIXON.

Models and Materials for Greek Iambic Verse.

By J. G. SARGENT. (Clarendon Press.) 4s. 6d.

This little book will be welcomed by those who still uphold the writing of Greek Iambic verse, as a help to the more thorough appreciation of the Tragedians, and the assimilation of their thoughts and diction.

The work is divided into three parts: first, Models, i.e. selections from Tragic authors mostly of a sententious character, and arranged under heads, such as Honour, Morning, Shoes (this enumeration will show sufficiently the variety of the subjects); then, Materials, i.e. passages from English authors to be turned into Iambics, with references below to some line or sentence of similar import in Greek, and lastly an Index, on the same principles as part i., only giving references and not quotations. The first part should be not only studied, but the more congenial passages learnt by heart: the chief fault to be found in it is that the selections are inevitably more often from Euripides than from the other two great Tragedians, and are in some cases rather dry and didactic. But they form a suitable introduction to the longer and more impassioned narratives, which must become familiar to all who would enter into the full spirit of their authors, and be saturated with their style.

The materials are well selected, and may be recommended safely to those who have to cast about for suitable pieces for translation. No references are given either in 'Models' or 'Materials' to the authors from which they are taken: a saving of the printer's labour, and perhaps a useful puzzle for inquiring minds, but there are cases where one would gladly have a clue to the source from which the extract comes.

E. D. S.

Zur Gutturalfrage im Gotischen. Inaugural Dissertation. Von HELEN L. WEBSTER. Boston, U.S.A. 1889. Pp. 90.

A DISSERTATION presented for the doctorate by an American lady at the University of Zürich on a subject of Germanic philology is perhaps an earnest of much creditable work to come from the graduate

of the colleges open to women in this country. It is written in German but printed in Boston, which latter circumstance is doubtless responsible for some misprints, and perhaps for certain inconsistencies in spelling, such as the use of *v* and *w* in Anglo-Saxon words. The words containing guttural sounds in Gothic, or sounds which had their origin in guttural (including palatal) sounds, whether alone or combined with a following *w*, are carefully examined, and the attempt made to determine for each case whether a velar guttural or a palatal spirant was the source, and also what determined the presence or absence of the *w* sound, as in Gothic *gw*, *q* (= *kw*), *hw*, and sometimes *f*. The total (not given by the author) of the cases considered in the various lists given appears to be about 410, and of this number about 170—considerably over one third—are classed as of uncertain etymology, in which accordingly it is doubtful whether the original consonant was a velar guttural or a palatal spirant. The numbering of these lists is confusing; it does not appear, for instance, why those lettered *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, *e* are arranged as sub-lists under that numbered 2 (II. in the dissertation itself), as if they consisted simply of specially selected words containing a medial guttural, which is not the case. The difficulty is increased by the apparent omission of the word 'velar' in the heading of the first line under 2, so that it seems to be meant to include at least the lists *a* and *b* which come next in order. If the first list under 2 were lettered *a* and the lettering then continued through *f*, it would be clearer. Under 8 *b* the heading in the table of contents and the corresponding wording on p. 83 do not cover all that is said in the following paragraphs. It is true that these are not matters which necessarily indicate any lack of diligence or competence, but they interfere with a ready understanding of the author's work. In the last list, p. 85, containing words with *f* instead of *gw* (apparently for *hw*) one looks for a mention of the numerals *ainlif* and *twalif*, even if it be only to express an opinion that their *f* does not represent an older labialized guttural.

After the examination of individual cases is concluded, the rules for the labial affection given by Kluge in his *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Conjugation* are criticized, and it is attempted to show that they are not proved, but that the rule for Gothic is similar to the conclusion reached by Bersu for Latin; namely, that the previously existing or pre-Germanic state of the guttural consonants, as far as labialization is concerned, has been preserved almost without change; that is, that the labial affection is not the result of specifically Germanic laws. The argument is mainly that, where Gothic shows the labial affection, it also appears in Latin, Greek or Celtic, if the corresponding word is found; and where Gothic does not show it, those languages do not; cf. Gothic *giman*, Latin *venire*, Greek *Baireu*, on the one hand, and Gothic *haurds*, Latin *crates*, Gothic *hups*, Latin *cubare*, Gothic *gasts*, Latin *hostis* on the other, with some other examples. Here it would have been well to give (1) the number of Gothic words showing labialization, (2) the number without labialization, (3) the number of agreements for both classes with Latin, or Greek or Celtic, (4) the number of Gothic cases whose etymological relations are uncertain. From a perhaps not quite accurate count based on the preceding list it appears that the number for (1) is 50, omitting the case of original palatal spirant + *w* and also omitting Gothic *ggw* with unoriginal *gg*, but including the words under 9, *a*, *b*, *c*; while the number for (4) is 15. In other hands the material might make the latter number larger and the former smaller, and indeed it

is not quite clear from the discussion of *afhawpan*, p. 9, *hwiltri*, p. 10 (cf. p. 86), and *agizi*, p. 14, why these words are not classed with those of uncertain etymology.

But it is not so important that a doctor dissertation should settle a doubtful point beyond dispute, as that it should show that its author has the ability to

discuss questions in the scientific spirit, and has a knowledge of the arguments already presented as well as of the materials available, and this appears to be the case in the present instance.

E. S. SHELDON,
Harvard University.

NOTES.

W. T. LENDRUM ON CLAUSES FOLLOWING 'EXPECTATION,' *Classical Review* for March, p. 100.

No doubt Mr. Lendrum correctly limits the prevailing Attic usage; but his canon makes too much of a purely formal distinction, which is not even absolute. Every infinitive, if only as an abstract, by definition involves a subject: the expression of this subject is only the explication of the implicit, which is formally developed only in proportion to the separable and individual importance of the two actions—that of the leading verb, and that of the infinitive: where these are closely integrated (as 'I may (to) read'), so that the former becomes a preliminary auxiliary part of the latter, the development by expression of the subject is a gratuitous intrusion and an interruption of continuity in thought. But the subject is persistent; and any formal discrimination is overborne by our abiding confidence in the real presence and the self-sufficiency of the implicit. Hence Goodwin and Monro are validated.

In these combinations, the leading verb implies futurity (Gil. L. G. § 240, 3, 515, 43, 659); and hence futurity expressed by the dependent verb is only emphasised by explication, invited here by the separate importance of that verb as existing first in independent thought; and since the future infinitive can in general be justified only thus, Thuc. 4, 13 (ἀεὶν) must be oblique. (The future infinitive with μέλλω, and the occasional future participle coincident with a future—as Isoc. *Paneg.* 185, ἐθελήσοντας—are best applied as explications through assimilation of proximity.) Moreover, the infinitive as an abstract is always future and the same idea grows out of its datival origin, unless limited by the terms of development to distinct time: in this sense it may be called timeless=omnitemporal. So that the combination of a verb of expectation with a present or aorist infinitive, the subject of which is implied, furnishes the necessary conditions for the conveyance of the contents of the thought.

(1) That the closest integration may be analysed, is shown *M. T.* 113. (Cf. provincial 'He wants that I should go.')

(2) That the widest analysis may be integrated is shown *M. T.* 127 (Cf. colloquial 'He said to learn (=that we should learn) this lesson.')

(3) For the presence of the implicit cf. *cupio esse clementem*, *cupio me esse clementem* (A. and G. *Lat. Gr.* 271, a, N. 1: their general doctrine, as shown in 271 Note, is untenable.): *licet mihi negligentem esse* (Gil. L. G. § 421, 535 R. 2): Good. *Gk. Gr.* 136, 3, 138, 8.

(4) The use of ᾗ μὴν implies consciousness of a subject.

(5) Of the examples now cited by Goodwin, I call attention especially to *Plat. Rep.* 573 C: *Lyeurg.* 60: *Dem.* xiii. 170.

CASKIE HARRISON,
The Brooklyn Latin School.

I VENTURE to put forward in the briefest possible form one or two suggestions on Plautus' *Menæchmi* and *Mostellaria*.

Men. 454.—For '*census capiant ilico*,' which no one has yet explained, read '*censu carcant ilico*.'

Ibid. 594—5. If these two lines keep the position they hold in the MSS., I think it necessary with Teuffel (*Studien* etc.) to take '*praedem dedit*' in 593 in the sense 'he caved in,' rather than in the sense which Brix gives them, namely, that the client accepted a regular trial and did not avail himself of a *sponsio*. But I am disposed to think that the lines are out of place, and should follow on v. 589 before the words '*Aput aediles, etc.*' In that case the sense given by Brix to the words *praedem dedit* is probably the better.

Most. 314.—*audi*; *em, tibist imperatum*: not, I think, addressed to Phaniscus, as Prof. Sonnenschein supposes, but rather to an inattentive slave, and accompanied with a blow.

Ibid. 432.—*quom med amisisti a te* does not give a very good rhythm. I should either keep the MS. reading *quom me amisisti a te*, with the hiatus at the caesura, or read *quom me amisisti < ita > a te*. It is noteworthy in how many lines of Plautus we have to choose between a very possible hiatus on the one hand and a very possible correction (sometimes more than one very possible correction) on the other. It looks as if there may have been different traditional readings of such lines—one avoiding the hiatus, the other admitting it—from very early times.

Ibid. 850.—That Theopropides should be frightened at a mosaic figure of a dog on the threshold, as Prof. Sonnenschein supposes, seems rather far-fetched, and it seems strange that no allusion to so absurd a mistake should be made by the other actors. More likely it was a property-dog—a stuffed one—that stood revealed when Tranio opened the door. The thing would be a 'safe laugh,' and the notion is not too farcical for Plautus.

E. S. THOMPSON.

* *

NOTES ON TACITUS' *DIALOGUS DE CLARIS ORATORIBUS*, AND ON SENECA' *APOCOCYNTOSIS*.

D. 10 ad fin. *nobis satis sit privatus et nostri saeculi controversias tueri, in quibus teipressis si quando necesse sit pro periclitante amico potentiorum aures offendere, et probata sit fides et libertas excusata.*

expressit C; om. Heumann et al.; *in quibus si quando ex re sit pro Baehrens.*

Perhaps *exercendis*, a very favourite verb with Tac. in this connexion: cf. *D.* 4. 5 *patrocinium ex*; *H.* 2. 10 *accusationes ex*; *A.* 6. 7 *delationes ex*; *A.* 13. 19 *aeumulatio exercebatur*; *A.* 13. 19 *contentio exercebatur*.

D. 39 ad fin. *satis constat C. Cornelium et M. Scaurum et T. Milonem et L. Bestiam et P. Vatinius concursu totius civitatis et accusatos et defensores, ut*

frigidissimos quoque oratores ipsa certantis populi studia excitare et incendere potuerint, itaque hercule eiusmodi libri extant, ut ipsi quoque qui tegerunt non aliis magis orationibus censeantur.

egerunt corr. ex egerint B; legerunt non a. m. o. accendantur Andresen; libri quoque extant ipsi qui Baehrens.

Andresen's *accendantur* is a violent change; I believe that both *egerunt* and *censeantur* are sound, and that some word like *infelicitur* has dropped out before *egerunt*. Tac. then says that in these *causes célèbres* all the speakers were so inspired by the eager crowds of listeners that even those who were on the losing side won their chief laurels in these cases. This explains the contrast indicated by *ipsi quoque*, which must otherwise be awkwardly opposed to *reis et causis* (Doederlein and Binde). The transposition of *quoque* advocated by Baehrens seems unlikely, and does not remove the difficulty. There are many examples of words having dropped out in this Dialogue.

Apocol. c. 9. 'olim,' inquit, 'magna res erat deum fieri: iam t'famam minum fecistis.'

Read *fabae Midam* here and in Cic. *Att.* i. 16, 13. See Gronovius on Pl. *Aul.* 811. 'Servus significans non parvam rem neque levem repperisse se, negat inventum sibi nihil maius quam quod pueri clamitant se repperisse in *fabâ*, nempe *vermiculum quem Midam vocant*, eum enim pueri in fabis quaerere solebant, quique inveniebat inde exsultare et velut triumphum agere.' 'Midas,' then, was the name of the 'rex' in the game so often referred to, though I cannot find out whence Gronovius gets his information. [I find that I have been anticipated in this emendation as regards Cic. *Att.* i. 16, 13., by Mr. Brooks of Trinity College, Dublin.]

Id. c. 13. *medius erat in hac cantantium turba Mnester pantomimus, quem Claudius decoris causa minorem fecerat.*

I suggest *minum* for *minorem*. Claudius promoted the pantomime to be a mime, that he might join the singers.

W. R. INGE.

LATIN VERSIONS OF A SAYING OF THE *Didaché*.—In the *Classical Review* for October 1888 (vol. ii. 262) the line of Piers Plowman,

Sit elemosina tua in manu tua donec studes cui des, was said to be a corruption of *Sudet elemosina tua, &c.*, a Latin version of the saying of the *Διδάχῃ*, ἰδρωτάτω ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη σου εἰς τὰς χεῖρας σου μέχρις ἂν γνῶς τίνι δῆς.

It is remarked in Resch's *Agrapha* p. 465 (1889) that this conjecture is confirmed by the discovery of the saying in question in the form *Desudet, &c.* in Cassiodorus and in a work of Petrus Comestor, who is cited in Piers Plowman as the 'clerke of the stories.'

But before the publication of the *Agrapha* I had learned from Dr. Westcott that a Latin version *Desudet, &c.* was extant in St. Bernard's Epist. xcv. (Migne *P.L.* tom. 182, col. 228):

Aliud est reficere ventrem esurientis, et aliud sanctam zelare paupertatem. Ibi enim servitur naturae, hic gratiae. Visitabis inquit speciem tuam, et non peccabis (Job v. 24). Ergo qui alienam carnem fovet, facit ne peccet: qui autem alienam sanctitatem honorat, fructificat sibi. Ideo ait: *Desudet elemosyna in manu tua, donec invenias (al. videas) justum cui des*. Quo fructu? Quoniam qui recipit justum in nomine justī, mercedem justī accipiet (Matth. x. 41). Solvamus proinde naturae debitum, ne peccemus:

simus gratiae coadjutores, ut et participes fieri mereamur.

St. Augustine has the saying in the form *Sudet, &c.* For more on this subject see *Traces of a saying of the Didaché* in the current number of the *Journal of Philology*, vol. xix. 148 sqq.

C. TAYLOR

* *

ARISTOPH. *Plutus*, l. 885.—I have seen no satisfactory explanation of the grammar, or emendation of, the text of this 'locus jamdiu conclamatus.' Dawes (*Misc. Critic.* p. 211) does violence to the genitive *δῆγματος* by rendering 'sed (annulus) non superabit sive non valebit contra *sycophantas morsum*.' Dobree thinks a line has fallen out, but in treating the text as it now stands takes the same view of the genitive. To supply *ἐποδὴ* or *ἰασις* from the preceding *δακτύλιον* as a peg whereon to hang the perplexing *δῆγματος* seems extraordinarily harsh. A different division of the letters and a very slight alteration of the text gives good sense and grammar. Instead of *ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐνεστι συνοφάρτου δῆγματος* I would propose to read *ἀλλ' οὐ κέ' ἐστι σ. δῆγματα*. This would then be a word of warning, spoken half-aside by Carion, against the Sycophant's deadly power, with direct reference to the Just Man's rash utterance, 'οὐδὲν προτιμῶ σου.'

I might mention in defence of the change *δῆγματος* to *δῆγματα* that the two preceding lines end with 'σ,' which may easily have caught the eye of the copyist who from his misreading of the previous words did not understand the passage, and have produced the generally received reading.

B. WYNNE-WILLSON.

NOTE.—If the change to *δῆγματα* seems too violent, I would suggest as a variant *ἀλλ' οὐ κενόν τι* (or *κενόν ἐστι*) σ. δῆγμα τοι.

* *

THE SHARK AND THE SAW-FISH.—In the May number of this *Review*, p. 234, I argued that the *pristis* is not 'a large fish, probably of the whale kind,' but unmistakably some kind of a shark; and that the name is not to be explained as the *spouter*, but as the *biter*. In the July number, p. 320, Mr. Thompson agrees that the *pristis* is not a whale or a *spouter*, but asserts that it is a saw-fish and a *sawyer*. The epigram which I cited from Leonidas of Tarentum conclusively disproves this assertion. The *pristis* there tore off (*ἀνελύσαστο*) and swallowed (*ἀνέβρωξεν*) the lower half of a sailor who was being hauled up into his ship after a dive. This is precisely what a shark often does, and what a saw-fish could not possibly do. Mr. Thompson says:—'Tradition unflatteringly identifies the *pristis* as the saw-fish (*pristis antiquorum*, L.), which is not rare in the Mediterranean, and the name of course simply means the *sawyer*.' It is not by any means a matter of course that the name means the *sawyer*. The meaning of the verb *πρίω* is just as often to *bite* as to *saw*. No evidence is adduced for the existence of this tradition beyond the fact that Linnaeus called the saw-fish the *pristis antiquorum*. Linnaeus may have been misled by the apparent identity of these ancient and modern names.

CECIL TORR.

* *

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

The 22nd annual meeting was held at Norwich, Conn., on July 8-10, President Chas. R. Lanman (Harvard) in the chair.

The following is a summary of the papers presented:

1. Dr. A. Gudeman (Johns Hopkins Univ.): 'On the knowledge of Roman literature and language among Greek prose writers.'

2. A. W. Nicholson (Harvard): 'On the modes of hair-cutting among the Greeks' (chiefly after Pollux).

3. A. W. V. Jackson Ph.D. (Columbia): 'On the Genitives in the Avesta.'

4. Prof. H. M. Reynolds (Yale): 'Aristophanes' criticism of Euripides.'

The writer collected and analysed the criticism of Aristophanes with the purpose of determining more accurately than has been done the scope, pertinency and animus of the comic poet; especially how far the criticisms are true as well of Aeschylus and Sophocles. It was shown that the criticism is as remarkable for what it omits as for what it contains.

5. Dr. E. F. Leighton, Gloucester, Mass.: 'The Medicean MSS. of Cicero's Letters.'

This elaborate paper was confined chiefly to an account of the origin and history of the two MSS. that were copied from the archetypes, found respectively at Verona and Verelli. The lecturer then presented a brief review of the history of Italian MSS. of Cicero's letters and attempted to controvert the views of Haupt, Hofmann and others, who ascribed the transcription of these MSS. to Petrarch. They were copied, according to the writer's view, for Coluccio Salutati in Milan and sent to Florence about 1392. The pith of the paper, however, was the identification of the two MSS. sent to Salutati with the MSS. ascribed to Petrarch. This identification was proved by an examination of the inscriptions on the MSS. and also from the notes, summaries, glosses etc. in the margin. A gloss in the codex Poggianus was quoted in confirmation of the view presented. The paper concluded with the discussion of passages from the codices which seem to prove beyond question that these copies could never have been made by Petrarch but by scribes ignorant of Latin.

6. Prof. John C. Rolfe (Michigan Univ.): 'An inscribed Kotylos from Boeotia.'

The inscription was found by the writers in Thisbe in Boeotia. It is written in Boeotian characters and not later than 360 B.C., probably much earlier. It reads as follows:—

ΓΟΡΑΙΝΙΟΣ ΕΜΙΟΚ

ΤΥΛΟΣ ΚΑΛΟΣ ΚΑ

Γοργινίος ἐμὶ δὲ κότυλος καλὸς καλός,

and is chiefly remarkable for the interesting and perhaps unique use of a proper adjective to designate the owner of the vase, instead of the usual genitive.

7. Prof. W. A. Merrill, Miami Univ. (Oxford, Ohio): 'Sancti Minerva and early Spanish Philology.'

The speaker showed first, that there was no national school of philology in Spain and that Sanchez was the greatest of the few scholars produced by that country. Many of his doctrines are, however, very quaint, antiquated and even ridiculous. Nevertheless the influence of Minerva is still predominant in Spain and even in France.

8. Prof. T. D. Goodell (Yale): 'On the Order of Words in Greek.'

The speaker first criticized the treatment of the subject by others (Kühner, Short, Weil) and then

set forth his own views, reducing the principles which govern the order of words in Greek to three groups, syntactic, rhetorical and euphonic, that is, the necessity of making the syntax clear, the effort to give each element of thought its proper importance, and the desire for an agreeable flow of sound. Each group was taken up in detail with illustrations.

9. George B. Hussey Ph.D. (Princeton): 'On Continued Metaphor in Plato.'

A comparison or metaphor carried along at intervals through part of a dialogue is a striking characteristic of Plato's greatest works. The force and brilliancy of these continued metaphors can be estimated by counting the number of metaphorical words they contain. According to the elaborate statistical table presented by Mr. H., the use of continued metaphor rises gradually from the Cratylus through the Gorgias, Phaedo, Symposium up to the Phaedrus and then in similar gradations ebbs away in the Theaetetus, Sophist, Philebus to the Laws, the work of Plato's old age.

10. L. H. Elwell (Amherst): 'The Thief in Herodotus (II. 121).'

A study of comparative folklore.

11. Dr. S. Sachs (New York): 'The so-called Medusa Ludovisi.'

A very striking relief has been designated by Brunn and Dilthey as the last and most beautiful development of the Medusa type; others deny its character as the terror-inspiring Gorgoneion—in fact they do not consider it a relief at all, but a fragment of a heroic stature. The author of the paper accepts this latter view and considers that the fragmentary head was hurriedly attached to a marble disk to save it from further destruction. None of the European scholars have assigned a definite name to the head, but a comparison of its most striking features with a celebrated Pentheseilea statue at Vienna offers many points of analogy and makes it probable that in the so-called Medusa there is really represented an ideal head of the famous Amazonian queen, executed in the noblest style of Hellenic art.

12. Dr. I. Goebel (New York): 'A Mythological Relic in our Funeral Rites.'

13. W. I. Hunt (Yale): 'On Homeric Wit and Humour.'

14. Prof. F. A. March (Lafayette): 'Studies in the Vocabularies of English Poetry (Shakespeare, Milton, Tennyson).'

15. Prof. B. I. Wheeler (Cornell): 'The origin of Greek Names in -eus.'

16. I. P. Deane (Cornell): 'Deliberative Questions Indicative and Subjunctive in Terence.'

17. Dr. A. Gudeman (Johns Hopkins): 'An emendation to Plut. Cic. 29.' (διὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τῶν <Ταραντίου cod. Mat. >)

The writer first shows that the codex Matritensis discovered by Chas. Grann is absolutely untrustworthy with regard to proper names, whatever value some of its other readings may possess. Although this fact would be in itself sufficient to condemn the *Ταραντίου*, strong internal proof of the spuriousness of the addition is not wanting. But as the reading of our MSS. has never given complete satisfaction the writer proposes to read διὰ Καρύλλου for διὰ Τύλλου, the corruption being due to a dittography of the α thus: διακαρύλλου—διακαρύλλου—διατύλλου. Aside from the palaeographical simplicity of the emendation, the conjecture derives weighty confirmation from the context and from chronological considerations. Catullus being completely unknown to Plutarch and throughout the middle ages, the τῶν will furnish no objection either. If the conjecture be accepted as true, the question as to the identity of Lesbia and

Clodia will be settled, once for all, in favour of the affirmative.

18. W. I. Hunt (Yale) gave a graphic account of Dorpfeld's famous theory of the Construction of the Greek Theatre.

19. Prof. W. A. Merrill: 'Remarks on the Preliminary Report of the Committee of the American Ass. for the Advancement of Science on the Spelling and Pronunciation of Chemical Terms.'

This report was distributed and criticism invited. The most radical proposition was the dropping of the final *e* in hydride, chlorine and similar words.

20. Otto Dietrich Ph.D. (Milwaukee): 'The German prefix 'ent.'

21. The Negro Element in Fiction by Prof. W. S. Scarborough (Wilberforce Ohio): Read by title.

22. Prof. Thos. D. Seymour (Yale): 'The Logical Value of the Homeric Caesura.'

23. Prof. F. D. Allen (Harvard): 'Gaius Remnius of Brundisium.'

On the evening of the first day Prof. Chas. R. Lanman delivered the President's address, taking for his subject 'Early Hindoo Pantheism.'

The following officers were elected for the ensuing year: President, Dr. S. Sachs (New York); Vice-Presidents: Prof. Wm. G. Hale (Cornell) and Prof. S. Hart (Trinity); Secretary, Curator and Treasurer: Prof. H. W. Smyth (Bryn Mawr); Executive Committee: the officers named above with Prof. O. M. Fernald (Williams), Prof. B. L. Gildersleeve (Johns Hopkins), Prof. W. W. Goodwin (Harvard), Prof. F. A. March (Lafayette), Prof. W. D. Whitney (Yale). The next meeting of the Association will be held at Princeton, July 7, 1891.

A. GUDEMAN.

* * *

A CORRECTION.—May I ask that the following corrections should be made in my note in the July number (p. 317)? The heading should be 2 Cor. vi. 14 (not vi. 2); 'verbal bull' at the end of col. 2, §§ 3 should be 'verbal lure'; I should also wish to recall the remark in the 5th §§, ('Romans is strangely spoken of as a late letter'), which I see now is not justified by anything in Mr. Chase's note.

R. WHITELAW.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

ACQUISITIONS OF BRITISH MUSEUM.

1. A krater with red figures, very late rough style; *obv.* banquet scene, *rev.* draped figures. From Rhodes.

2. Fragment of green glazed ware, part of a vase with figure of Herakles in relief. Found in the baths of Caracalla at Rome.

3. Two Roman seal cases in bronze.

4. A pleasure intaglio, bird; and four bronze dice.

5. Fragment of mould for a bowl, with relief representing a Satyr pouring wine from a skin into a vase. From Arezzo.

6. A porcelain horse's head, a small lead vase, and a lamp of black ware. From Tell Basta.

7. A series of late Greek imprecations, *dirae*, on lead and talc: the formulae are much the same as those employed on magical papyri. Some of them are of considerable length, and still retain the nails which were used for attaching them. From Cyprus.

8. A three-handled vase of Mycenaean fabric (form *Myk. Vasen* no. 32), height 4½ in. diam. 8½ in., painted with designs in black varnish colour on the yellowish clay. These represent three naturalistic representations of a nautilus, amid seaweeds &c. which seem to be growing from the upper and lower borders of the design and from the handles. On the base is a geometric arrangement of curved lines forming across within a lozenge.

8. The Museum has now completed the purchase of the collection of gems belonging to the Earl of Carlisle (Michaelis, *Ancient Marbles* p. 332).

C. S.

Athenische Mittheilungen. 1890, part 2. Athens.

1. Judeich: Iasos. A description of the ruins of the ancient town, visited by Winter and himself in 1887: recognizes the remains of an old and a new town; the destruction of the old town probably took place about B.C. 405. Publishes four inscriptions from New-Iasos: plan and seven cuts. 2. Mordtmann: (i) an inscription from Poemanennum published *Rev. Arch.* 1877, p. 106: (ii) on the occurrence in Phrygia of the form *ειστροπην*: compares similar forms. 3. Meier: publishes (in text) a curious inscribed gladiatorial relief now in the Trieste Museum; the defeated retiarius stands on a platform asking for the missio; the secu-

tor advances up the steps to kill him. 4. Dörpfeld: metrological notes. V. The Aeginetic-Attic system of measurement; 'the Erechtheion is built on a scale of which the foot measures about 0.33 m.; since in the inscription this foot is termed merely δ *πούς*, it follows that this was the usual length of the Attic foot of that time.' From a comparison of examples, we find that it lay between 0.326 and 0.328. VI. The Greek Stadion; discusses the dimensions of the various stadia in use and mentioned by writers. 5. Wolters: the statue of a warrior from Delos (Reinach in *Bull. de Corr.* 1884, p. 178; 1889, p. 113). Compares it with the style of the Pergamene altar rather than with that of the Borghese warrior. It probably does not belong to the vase inscribed with the name Agasias, but to a group referred to in the inscription *Mon. Grecs*, I. 8, p. 44; it represents a Gaul overthrown by a mounted warrior; cut in text. 6. Heberley: a series of sepulchral reliefs from Thessaly, noted in a journey, principally at Tyrnavo; with remarks on the characteristics of this local style: four plates, three cuts. 7. Schliemann: six inscriptions from Ilion. 8. Wilhelm: psephisma in honour of the comic poet Amphis. 9. Thumb: inscription from Megaris. 10. Wolters: archaic Attic grave-stone.

Bibliography. Notes on discoveries at Troja, Lykosura, Megalopolis, Mantinea, Tegea, Mykenae [W.D.]: at Nauplia, Patras, Marathon [P. W.].

Archäologisches Jahrbuch. 1890, part 1. Berlin.

1. A letter written by W. Studemund shortly before his death, on the mosaic of Monnus at Trèves published *Antike Denkm.* I. pll. 47-49, dealing especially with the nomenclature of the Muses therein represented. 2. Michaelis: history of the court of statues in the Vatican Belvedere; with three 'Anhangen' viz. (i) Aldrovandi Boissart and Sandrart. Schott. Gamucci. (ii) The Vatican statues sent away by Pius the Fifth. (iii) *Abbildungen und Nachbildungen* of the Belvedere antiquities; nine cuts. 3. Schöne: the Nauplius legend related by Hyginus (*Fab. exvi.*); compares the same story as told (after Philo of Byzantium) in a work by Hero about automata.

Anzeiger. Gymnasialunterricht und archaeology:

arrangement for a meeting of archaeologists. Report of acquisitions—Karlsruhe, Brunswick, Bonn, Breslau, Erlangen, Göttingen, Marburg-Würzburg, Siegburg. Meeting of the Institute at Berlin. News of the Institute. Notes on publications of the Institute. Aphrodite on the goat (*Jahrb.* iv. 208) by Bethé: two cuts. On the chariot group in the East Pediment at Olympia, by Engelmann. Bibliography.

Archaeologische-Epigraphische Mittheilungen aus Oesterreich-Ungarn. 1890, part 1.

1. Klement: sculptures of Dalmatia; a supplementary note on Schneider's ante ix. 58, Spalato and Salona. 2. Riegl: late Roman personification of the months; points out how the Trier mosaic confirms his views already expressed on this point. 3. Kalinka and Swoboda: notes of a tour in the districts of the Drave and Save; with publication of sculptures, Roman inscriptions, &c.; plate. 4. Ziehen: Roman sculptures in the national museum at Pesh: including an interesting group of Medea with her children, two statuettes of Ikaros, reliefs with Perseus and Medusa, the flight of Iphigeneia, Apollo and Marsyas, &c.; twenty-three cuts. 5. Heberdey: notes suggested by the new publication of the François vase (*Wien. Vorlegebl.* 1888, ii-iv.): plate. 6. Schön: Mithraic relief and votive altar from Winzendorf. 7. Münsterburg: identifies the subject on a vase in the British Museum as the meeting of Paris and Helena and compares this Helena with the type on the Gjölbaschi relief. 8. Kubitschek: the Sullan era in Proconsular Asia. 9. D.R.: Greek inscription from Tomi. 10. Hula: epigraphical notes from Spalato. 11. Bormann: Roman inscriptions recovered and discovered. 12. Kubitschek: the notation and the beginning of the year in Roman Macedonia; and note on his previous article. 13. Rizzi: inscriptions from Pola. 14. Drexler: the god Kakasbos occurs on a Gnostic gem of the Cassel Museum. 15. Reich: addendum to his 'Griechische Weihgeschenke.'

The Same. 1890, part 2.

1. v. Domaszewski: studies in the history of the Danube provinces; (i) the limits of Moesia superior and the Illyrian frontier toll: with map. 2. v. Premerstein: epigraphical notes from Kärnten; (a) new inscriptions, (b) revised inscriptions. 3. Löhr; Achilles' departure from Skyros (*Mon. d. Inst.* xi. 33, *Wien. Vorlegebl.* d. viii. 2). The Skyros legend received marked attention in the fifth century when Kimon brought the bones of Theseus thence; identifies this subject on the *Mon.* vase and other vase-paintings: later representations. 4. Weisshäupl: Roman Hermes bust inscribed: two cuts. 5. Szanto: Inscriptions from Naxos. 6. Noldeke: on the Latin-Palmyrene inscription of Karānebes. 7. Kubitschek: a diary of the Abbate Alberto Fortis, who travelled in Dalmatia in the last century: the diary is now in the Hofbibliothek at Vienna; Greek and Roman inscriptions from it. 8. Heberdey: the raid of the Kostoboki into Greece; this is one of the few contemporary events mentioned by Pausanias (x. 34. 5): the book must therefore have been written after the year 175-6: proposes dating for all the books. 9. Téglás and Király: new inscriptions from Dacia. 10. Téglás: the site of Blandiana. 11. Kubitschek: in the era of Pompeius in Syria. 12. D.R.: inscriptions from Serajevo.

Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique. Jan.—Feb. 1890.

E. Hucher. 'Trésor de Plourhan' (continued). Description of the coins.—A. de Belfort. 'Recherche des monnaies impériales romaines non décrites dans l'ouvrage de H. Cohen' (continued). Fausta—Magnentius.

NO. XXXVI. VOL. IV.

Mar.—April 1890.

A. de Belfort. 'Recherche &c.' (continued). Decentius—Procopius.

May—June 1890.

A. de Belfort. 'Recherche &c.' (continued). Gratian—Romulus Augustulus.—W. Froehner. 'Variétés numismatiques.' Roman denarii; a large coin of Maximianus representing the evil eye, &c. W. W.

Revue numismatique.

Premier trimestre, 1890.—A. Vercoire, 'Explication de l'aureus frappé par P. Clodius à l'effigie de Marc Antoine.'—Earle Fox, 'Note sur quelques monnaies attiques rares et inédites.'—R. Mowat, 'Piaonius, nom de famille de l'empereur Victorin; Pius, surnom mobile des Tétricus.'—*Review.* Muret's 'Catalogue des monnaies gauloises.' By A. de Barthélemy.

Deuxième trimestre, 1890.—Th. Reinach, 'Sur l'époque et le nombre des nécorats de Cyzique.' Shows that the supposed third neocory is based on a mistaken reading.—*Chronique.* R. Mowat on the name Piaonius.—List of Greek coins acquired for the Cabinet des médailles at the Photiades sale.—*Reviews.* Wroth's *Pontus, Paphlagonia &c.*, by E. Babelon; Imhoof and Keller, *Tier- und Pflanzenbilder*; Soutzo's *Introduction à l'étude des monnaies de l'Italie antique.* W. W.

Numismatic Chronicle. 1890, parts I and II.

W. Greenwell. 'On a find of archaic Greek coins in Egypt.' Twenty-four coins (probably part of a larger hoard) found about three years ago in the Delta. They are all archaic and for the most part not later than B.C. 500. 'On account of the places to which they principally belong (Thasos, Corinth, Miletus, Cos, Cyprus, Tyre, Cyrene &c.) it is not improbable that they are the result of a trading voyage made along the coasts of the Aegean and neighbouring seas which ended in Egypt.'—W. Greenwell. 'On a find of archaic Greek coins, principally of the islands of the Aegean sea.' The composition of the hoard resembles that of the Santorin hoard of 1821, but includes some unpublished types.—W. Greenwell. 'On some rare Greek coins.' Describes specimens in Mr. Greenwell's collection especially some splendid staters of Cyzicus and Lampsacus.—H. Howorth. 'The initial coinage of Parthia.' On the coins of Andragoras, who, it is maintained, is identical with Phrataphernes, the Persian noble nominated satrap of Parthia by Alexander the Great.—*Reviews* (by B. V. Head) of Wroth's *Pontus, Paphlagonia, Bithynia &c.*; Soutzo's *Introduction à l'étude des monnaies de l'Italie antique*; Buechner's *De Neocoria.* W. W.

Zeitschrift für Numismatik (Berlin). Band xvii. Heft 2 (1890).

O. Seck, 'Die Münzpolitik Diocletians und seiner Nachfolger' (concluded).—A. Löbbecke, 'Münzfund bei Avola.' Description of a hoard of Greek coins discovered in the neighbourhood of Avola, S.W. of Syracuse. The hoard was contained in two jars, in one of which were 33 gold, and in the other about 150 silver coins. The hoard may have been deposited about B.C. 320, but most of the coins belong to the earlier part of the fourth century B.C. The gold specimens consist of four Darics, one stater of Abydos, fourteen staters of Lampsacus, and fourteen gold of Syracuse. The silver pieces are chiefly Corinthian. The stater of Abydos and five of the Lampsacenes are unpublished.—B. Pick. 'Ueber einige Münzen der römischen Kaiserzeit.'—*Miscellanea.* W. Drexler on a gold coin of Allectus not in Cohen.

WARWICK WROTH.

C C

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Athenaeum: 1890.—29 March, review of Verrall's *Agamemnon* and of Tucker's *Supplices*.—5 April, notice of Resch's *Agrapha* and Werner's *der Paulinismus des Irenaeus*: 19 Apr. review of Tozer's *Islands of the Aegean*; notice of Reynolds' *Athanasius* and W. H. Simcox' *The Language of the N. T.*—17 May, a Greek version of *Crossing the Bar* by E. L. Lushington. —24 May, notice of Macaulay's *Herodotus* and Dakyns' *Xenophon*.—31 May, notice of Cook Wilson's *On the Interpretation of the Timaeus*.—7 June, De Mirmont's *Ausonius*; notice of Dr. Schmitz. —28 June, notice of Westcott's *Hebrews*.—5 July, notice of Sloman's *St. Matthew* and Bendley's *Tertullian's Apology*.—26 July, review of Haigh's *Attic Theatre* and Dumon's *Le Théâtre de Polyclète*.—2 Aug. review of J. E. Harrison's *Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens*; letter from E. Gardner on *The Stage in the Greek Theatre*.—9 Aug. review of Owen's *Tristia*.—16 Aug. review of Thackeray's *Prudentius*.—23 Aug. review of Morrison's *The Jews under Roman Rule*, notice of King and Cookson's *Introd. to Comp. Grammar of Greek and Latin*.—6 Sept. review of Rutherford's *Thucydides* iv.

Academy: 1890.—22 March, review by F. Haverveld of Cagnat's *Cours d'Épigraphie latine* and *L'Année épigraphique* 1888, notices of a number of schoolbooks.—12 April, review by Rob. Ellis of Schepss' *Conrad of Hirschau's Dialogus super auctores*.—26 Apr. notices of Merry's *Birds*, Headlam's *Iphig. at Aulis*, Cowan's *Pliny's Letters i and ii*, Godley's *Histories of Tacitus* iii.—v., Inge's *Valerius Maximus*, Jeyes' *Aristotle's Ethics*, Schöne's *Tacitus' Agricola*, Schubert's *Oedipus Rex*.—3 May, review by F. T. Richards of Dakyns' *Xenophon* and Macaulay's *Herodotus*.—10 May, review by J. P. Mahaffy of Tozer's *Islands of the Aegean*.—17 May, review by C. Oman of Wroth's *B. M. Catalogue of Greek Coins; Pontus, Bithynia and Bosphorus*.—24 May, review by A. S. Wilkins of Ribbeck's *History of Roman Poetry in the Augustan Age*.—31 May, review by F. Haverveld of Wharton's *Elyma Latina*.—7 June, review by F. T. Richards of Welzhofer's *Geschichte des griechischen Volkes bis zur Zeit Solons*, by J. P. Postgate of Goodwin's *Syntax* 2nd edit. —14 June, notices of Oman's *History of Greece*, F. E. Thompson's *Homeric Grammar* etc.—21 June, notices of Neue's *Formenlehre*, Reisig's *Vorlesungen*, Georges' *Lexikon d. lateinischen Wortformen*, etc.; review by Talfourd Ely of J. E. Harrison's *Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens*.—28 June, notices of Sandys' *Dem. Leptines*, Adam's *Euthyphro*, Stephenson's *Livy* iv. Shuckburgh's *Herodotus* v., Abbott and Mattheson's *Dem. Phil.* vol. ii., P. Cauer's *Iliad* etc., review by A. S. Wilkins of Schrader's *Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan peoples* (tr. by Jevons).—5 July, review by E. A. Sonnenschein of Studemund's *Apographon of Plautus*.—19 July, review by H. T. Wharton of Luniak's *Quaestiones Sapphicæ*.—2 Aug. review by Rob. Ellis of Thackeray's *Prudentius*.—9 Aug. review by W. Sanday of Hoskier's *Collation of Cod. Ev. 604*, by I. Taylor of Prou's *Manuel de Paléographie*; notice of W. Christ's *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur*.—23 Aug. H. C. Hoskier on above review.—30 Aug. review by A. H. Sayce of Taylor's *Origin of the Aryans*.—6 Sept. notice of Stock's *Cic. p. Roscio*, W. F. Allen's *Tacitus Ann.* i.—iv. and A. T. Christ's *Plato's Gorgias*; Messrs. Sayce and Mahaffy announce the discovery by Mr. Flinders Petrie in Egypt of certain Greek papyri of the third

century B.C. containing fragments of the *Phaedo*, of the *Antiope* of Euripides, etc.

Deutsche Literaturzeitung.

No. 10. Koetschau, *Die Textüberlieferung der Bücher des Origenes gegen Celsus*. Prolegomena to a new edition of *Orig. c. C.* 'The MSS. all go back to Vat. 386 and Par. Suppl. Gr. 616; the archetype of both will form the basis of the new edition. Important for supplementing and controlling is the *Philokalia*, containing the seventh part of *Orig. c. C.* There are three families represented by (a) Ven. 47 and cod. Patmus, s. x, (b) Ven. 122 and Par. Suppl. Gr. 615, (c) Ven. 48 and Par. 456.' In the main, K. agrees with Robinson (*Jour. of Phil.* 1889, p. 66 ff.), but leads Par. 940 directly back to archetype.—Rosbach u. Westphal, *Theorie der musischen Künste der Hellenen*. III. 2. Spezielle griechische Metrik. This new edition is almost entirely rewritten. In no branch of philology does one book stand so distinctly in front of all others as does R. and W.'s in Greek metrics.—Matzat, *Römische Zeitrechnung für die Jahre 219-1 v. Chr.* Chronological tables according to the principles laid down in M.'s *Römische Chronologie*. M. has modified his views somewhat (*Hermes* xxiv. 570 ff.); tries here to bring the statements of historians into harmony with his tables, attributing most differences to the carelessness of the former.—Reisch, *Griechische Weihgeschenke*. A very clear and instructive essay, containing many new and happy suggestions.

No. 11. Landgraf, *Untersuchungen zu Caesar und seinen Fortsetzern insbesondere über die Autorschaft und Composition des Bellum Alexandr. u. B. Afric.* L. shows convincingly that the *B. Afric.* of which the text has suffered many corruptions, was written by a highly educated man, but his assertion that Pollio was the author seems to be merely a probable hypothesis. L.'s comparison of phrases of the *B. Afric.* and Pollio's letters need a thorough sifting. In the *B. Alex.* L. distinguishes Caesarian, Pollian, and Hirtian parts on similar weak grounds.—Schmalz, *Ueber den Sprachgebrauch des Asinius Pollio*, 2nd ed. The second edition of phrases of the essay needs no words of praise.

No. 12. *Catalogus cod. Graecorum qui in bibliotheca urtica Vratislaviensi adservantur ed. philologi Vratislavienses*. A good catalogue. Very few MSS. remain uncollated.—*Sophoclis tragoediae* rec. expl. Wunderus ed. V^{ta} cur. Wecklein. Improved. Contains about sixty new, mostly convincing, emendations.—Reckzey, *Ueber grammatische und rhetorische Stellung des Adjectivums bei den Annalisten, Cato und Sallust*. Highly instructive.

No. 13. Meister, *Die griechischen Dialekte*. II. Eleisch, Arkadisch, Cyprisch. The arrangement causes some inconveniences (repetitions, etc.). The account of the literature ought to be more complete. For the Arcadian and Cyprian new inscriptional material and some suggestive monographs have appeared since the publication of this work.—Smythe, *The Arcaeo-Cyprian Dialect* (Trans. Am. Ph. As. xviii.). Convenient and practical collection of the inscriptional material. The glosses have been entirely neglected. Contains nothing new.—*T. Livi ab urbe condita libb.* ed. Luchs. IV. [xxvi.—xxx.]. The critical apparatus is more condensed than in L.'s larger edition of the same books in 1879. Much has been added. The text improved in about 114 places.—*Karten von Attika*.....hrsg. v. Curtius u. Kaupert.

V., VI. Erläuternder Text zu III. u. IV. v. Milchhofer. The maps are excellent. M.'s text, although sometimes unclear and incomplete, is indispensable.

No. 14. *Euripides' Heracles*, ed. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. I. (Einleitung in die attische Tragödie). II. (Text u. Commentar). Chap. 2 answers the question, 'What is an Attic tragedy?' and rejects Aristotle's misconception of the same. Ch. 3 gives the history of the text. In ch. 4 'Ways and aims of modern criticism.' W. draws a rather pessimistic picture, and he certainly goes too far in his condemnation of the modern mania of textual changes. Ch. 5 gives an excellent synopsis of the Heracles myth. Ch. 6 deals with the Euripidean Heracles, which W. assumes to have been performed between 423 and 416. W.'s textual criticism is exceedingly brilliant; the commentary is rich with an almost inexhaustible source of information.—Mommson, *Römisches Staatsrecht*. I.-III. Sets forth the results of a life's work. It lays the foundation, and is at the same time definitive for the present.

No. 15. *Ausonii Burdigalensis opuscula* rec. Peiper (1886). A good var. lect. enables the reader everywhere to form an independent judgment. Some of P.'s conjectures, in which he is more sparing than Schenkl, are very happy: Parent. 9, 6 'moribus atque'; Caes. Tetrast. 3, 4 'prodidit'; Ep. 12, 57 'mellae.' His views about the tradition are very questionable and partly already refuted.—*Ausonii Mosella*, Edition critique... par H. de la Ville de Mirmont. Extremely careful history of the text, but (450) 'Augusti, pater et natus,' and the refutation of Böcking's explanation of 409 seem to be the only lasting results.

No. 16. *Platon's Phaedon*, philosophisch erklärt... von S. Baumann. B. examines the different proofs for the immortality of the soul, from Plato down to our time, and finding their essence already in the *Phaedo*, he discusses those (and Mendelssohn's amplification of them). The philosophical examination added to each paragraph is clear, and will be welcome to every reader of the dialogue.—Groeger, *De Argonauticarum fabularum historia quæst. sell.* Absurd, but scattered here and there are some good observations.—Soltan, *Die römischen Amtsjahre auf ihren natürlichen Zeitbezug reduziert*.—Soltan, *Römische Chronologie*. These works give a good synopsis of the attempts made during the last few years for the solution of this problem. As a manual they are of small value. Many errors of S.'s predecessors are repeated; other theories are built on misunderstood passages of ancient authors, etc.

No. 17. *Jahresberichte über das höhere Schulwesen*, hrsgb. v. Rethwisch, III. Jhrg. A good survey of the literature of 1888. R. is in favour of a reform of the higher schools, but against the 'Einheitsschule.' Ziemer (Latin) advocates Hornemann's Einheitsschule. Bamberg (Greek) gives valuable contributions towards the simplification of Greek school-grammars.—Blass, *Ueber die Aussprache des Griechischen*. Third edition, with such corrections and additions as recent investigations have made necessary. On fundamental questions there can be no longer any controversy among unprejudiced men.—Zacher, *Die Aussprache des Griechischen*. To be read by a wider circle. Based on Blass without following him slavishly. *Μοραειδὲς φθόγγος* (*Empir. ad. math.* p. 625 Bk.). Z. takes rightly (against Blass) as 'simple vowels written with two letters.' ζ he considers = dz (Blass zd).—*Plauti comœdiæ rec.*... Ritscheliuss. III. 5. (Menaechmi). The united labours of Löwe and Schöll give a full collation of cod. Ambrosian. In a number of places Schöll has

not followed Ritschl's audacious conjectures. With great tact he avoids both hypercriticism and excessive faith in the tradition.

No. 18. Rohde, *Psyche, Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen*. I. Of uncommon importance and interest. R. regards Homer as representing not the most ancient religious belief of the Greeks, but an advanced, rationalistic stage. Remnants of old ancestor-worship linger on in Homer; and also in the myth of the five ages. A successful attempt to lay a firm basis for mythological researches on Greek soil, after the failure of Kuhn-Müller's method of comparative mythology.—*Commentationes in honorem Studemund...*... scrips. discipuli. Prehn, Statistical account of adjectives in -bundus. Blase, Contributions to syntax of Latin conditional sentences. Cramer, Infinitives in Manilius. Hansen, Origin of cases, gender, and formation of abstract nouns. Voltz, *Περὶ παθῶν τοῦ ἡρωικοῦ μέτρου*. Schoemann, Diogenian as a source of the Etymol. Mag. Consrubach, Traces the treatise *περὶ κομῆδας* back to its sources, Aristoteles and Krates. Kuhn, Time of Eustathios' commentaries (1170-1185). Egenolff finishes his edition of Anonymi Epitome Dionysii Thracis. Zarncke, Catalogue of the library of a Murbach monastery. Grube, The authors of the Institutiones Justinian. Goldstaub, Who held the sovereignty at Rome and Athens? Geil, On Plato's doctrine of μέρη τῆς ψυχῆς. Back, On Plat. Phaidr. 246 R. Stern tries to show that Diodorus I.-XX. used Theopompus. Haellling, On the titles of Cicero's *De inventione*. Habel, the worship of the Syrian Sol invictus at Rome. Hoffmann brings further proofs that the Apollo Belvidero had a bow, not the aegis, in his hand.—Haebelin, *Studien zur Aphrodite von Melos*. 'The disputed fragments belong to the statue. The lower arm, from wrist to elbow, was almost vertical, forming an obtuse angle with the upper arm.' Hardly satisfactory.

Litterarisches Centralblatt.

No. 11. *Catalogus codicum Graecorum qui in bibliotheca urtica Vratislaviensi adserantur ed. philologi Vratislavienses*. Very satisfactory description of the MSS.—Marcelli, *De medicamentis lib.* ed. Helmreich. This careful and exact edition deserves warm praise.

No. 12. Gutschmidt's *Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. v. Rühl. I. Schriften zur Aegyptologie u. zur Geschichte der griechischen Chronologie. Indispensable for any philologist.—Schmitt, *Ueber den Ursprung des Substantivsatzes mit Relativpartikeln im Griechischen* (Schanz's Beiträge, III. 2). An interesting discussion of relative clauses introduced by δ, δτι, δτι, etc. 'δ and δτι are accusatives of inner object, e.g. δὲ ὅτι νοσεῖς = 'I know with what thou art sick.' δτι = δτι (accus.) is older than δ and δτι.' The second chapter deals with the changes of persons, tenses, and modes.—Hölzer, *Beiträge zu einer Theorie der lateinischen Semasiologie* (Berliner Stud. VI. 3). Often unclear, without scientific worth, and of doubtful practical usefulness.—Schuchardt, *Schliemann's Ausgrabungen...* im Lichte der heutigen Wissenschaft dargestellt. Taking into account the results of the latest researches, Schuchardt gives a good picture of the culture of the heroic age.

No. 13. Grasserie, *Études de grammaire comparée*. On the conception and origin of cases. The Indo-European part is very weak.—Schradler, *Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte*, 2nd ed. Contains six new chapters. The whole is greatly improved. Of special interest is the chapter on family and state.—Caland, *Ueber Totenverehrung bei einigen der indogermanischen Völker*. A valuable treatise, dealing

especially with Indian customs, Greeks p. 69-73; Romans 74-77.

No. 14. Λάμπρος, Κατάλογος τῶν ἐν ταῖς βιβλιοθήκαις τοῦ Ἀγίου Ὁρους ἑλληνικῶν κωδικῶν Α', α'. The difficult task has been done with great care. The present volume catalogues the MSS. of the libraries τοῦ Πρωτάτου, St. Annae, and of the monasteries Pauli, Chilianarii, Zographi, Konstamoniti, Gregorii and Xenophontis. It is to be hoped that A. may find the necessary support for further publications.

No. 15. Soltan, *Zur Erklärung... der Reden des... Hanno im 5ten Akt des Poenulus* (Berl. Stud.). Worthless.—*Plutarchi Chaeronensis moralia*, rec. Bernardakis. II. The text is greatly improved. For π. τῆς Ρωμαίων τύχης and π. τῆς Ἀλεξ. τύχ. ἡ ἀπερ. a cod. Palat. 153 gives a number of readings preferable to those chosen by B. The conjectures of modern scholars ought to have been stated more fully.

No. 16. Heyden, *Die Tracht der Culturvölker Europas vom Zeitalter Homers bis zum XIX. Jh.* Excellent, concise, based on the study of many years.—*Orosii historiarum adversum Paganos*, libb. vii. rec. Zangemeister. The apparatus criticus of the ed. maior has been omitted. Few changes have been made in the text.

No. 17. Philonis libellus de officio mundi ed. Cohn. Specimen of a complete edition of Philo. Well deserves the prize of the Berlin Academy.—*Taciti de vita et moribus Agricolae* ed. Schoene. Contains over 100 conjectures, some of them happy ('mari' 18, 'ac rudi aeri' = 'ac ludere,' MS. 19), others unnecessary and very bold. Noteworthy is the great number of parallel passages in the commentary.—*Denkmäler griechischer und römischer Sculptur*, hrsg. v. Bruckmann (14-19). Excellent, like the former instalments.

No. 18. Boutkouski Glinka, *Petit Mionet de Poche*. Careful collection and description of Greek coins, geographically arranged. A handy manual for travellers.—Schöffers, *De Deli insulae rebus*. Based on a careful collection of all the inscriptional material thus far accessible. The chapters on 'Delian Government' and 'Administration of Temples' are especially good.—Graul, *Die antiken Porträtmalerei aus den Grabstätten des Faiyum*. (Illustr.). Enlarged reprint of an essay published in *Liitzow's Z. f. bild. Kunst*. The two arguments which led G. to assign a late date to the pictures have since been shown to be inconclusive.

No. 19. Matzat, *Römische Zeitrechnung für 219—1 v. Chr.* Deserves careful study, although it is in many points open to criticism.—Gurlitt, *Über Pausanias*. Places the Pausanias criticism on a sound basis. Separates sharply λόγος and θεωρήματα. Emphasizes autopsy, which G. proves for Piræus, Athens, Olympia. Attacks the Polemon-hypothesis.—*Valerii Maximi factorum et dictorum memorab.* libb. ix. ed. Kempf. Lays foundation for text and further investigations. For the former, cod. A (Bernensis) and L (aurentianus) have been collated.

No. 20. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* by Richardson. Supplement to the American ed. Contains a bibliographical index, which is very noteworthy both for completeness and for accuracy.—Soltan, *Die römischen Amtsjahre*. Prolegomena for a Roman Chronology. Proves convincingly the correctness of the Polybian synchronism for the battle of the Allia.—*Asini Polionis de Bello Africo* comment. ed. Wölfflin et Miodonski. Gives the readings of cod. Ashburnham, saec. x., oldest of all MSS. The cod. Leidensis yielded also valuable material. The notes contain a vast mass of learning.—Opitz, *Schauspiel und*

Theaterwesen der Griechen und Römer (Culturbilder a. d. class. Alterth. V.). Popular, but resting on good scientific basis.

No. 21. (a) *Die Matrikel der Universität Heidelberg von 1386—1662* hrsg. v. Toepeke. (b) *Ältere Universitätsmatrikeln I. Frankfurt a. O.* hrsg. v. Friedländer, vol. II. (1649—1811) [= *Publikationen aus d. kgl. preussischen Staatsarchiven* vol. xxxvi.] (c) *Die Matrikel der Universität Rostock I.* (1419—1499). Give valuable historical material.—Reisch, *Griechische Weihgeschenke*. I. 'The votive offerings have their origin in the anthropomorphic conception of the gods.' They are divided into (a) images of the gods and their deeds, (b) images of men and their deeds, (c) human implements. II. Discusses the agonistic votive offerings (especially the Icaros relief). III. the prize tripods of the phylai-choruses. IV. the votive offerings of the scenic choregi. (The relief of Koropi published here for the first time is of special interest.)—Soutzo, *Introduction à l'étude des monnaies de l'Italie antique*. v. II. Application of the author's hypothesis (cf. *Lit. C. Bl.* 1888 No. 52) about money values in ancient Italy.

No. 22 Soltan, *Römische Chronologie*. The first part gives a very satisfactory sketch of the outlines of Roman Chronology. In the second part S. discusses the controversies of to-day and offers his own system. But it may be doubted, whether this will meet with greater approval than those of his predecessors.

No. 23. Regnaud, *Esquisse du véritable système primitif des voyelles dans les langues indo-européennes*. 'Worthless.'—Goerres, *Studien zur griechischen Mythologie I.* (Berliner stud. x. 2). Full of strange views. As G. refers to a yet unpublished larger work, where the proofs for them will be given, it is not yet time to criticise. G. is greatly influenced by H. D. Müller. He seems to lack familiarity with recent works in his field.—*Monumenti antichi pubbl. per cura della reale Accademia dei Lincei*. I. 1. Intended to be a supplement to the *Notizie degli scavi dell' antichità*. Contains Halbherr's report on the excavations of the temple of the Pythian Apollo at Gortyna, with interesting inscriptions (Illustr.). New fragments of archaic inscriptions published by Compagnot. Report of Pignoni on excavations in the province of Parma and an essay by Gamurrini on the weight of the Etruscan pound.

No. 24. Delbrück, *Die indogermanischen Verwandtschaftsnamen*. Of great interest and a model in method.—*Ciceronis ad Quintum fratrem epistola prima avec un commentaire critique et explicatif* par Antoine. Contains nothing new.

Leipsiger Studien, vol. xi. Suppl. (1889). A valuable essay on Strabo's *ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα* by Paul Meyer. It contains (1) an account of the work and its character: (2) the text of the fragments with a short commentary: (3) *Quaestiones Strabonianae*, discussing the relations between Strabo and Josephus, Appian, and Plutarch.

Dictionnaire Latin-Français, par L. Quicherat et A. Daveluy. New edition, revised and corrected by Emil Chatelain. Paris: Hachette, 1889.

In a very sensible preface, which shows that he is fully aware of the difficulties which beset modern Latin lexicography, M. Chatelain informs us that the revision of Quicherat's lexicon has occupied his leisure time during seven years. The book is a great improvement on previous editions, and embodies many of the results of recent research. But in seven years little can be done by one man in this almost limitless field, and much traditional error therefore remains uncorrected. Without a well organized system of co-operation, our current Latin lexicons

must, in large parts, remain for some time in an unreformed condition.

H. I. De *Dompierre de Chaufepié*, De Titulo I. R. N. 4312 ad Iuvenalem Poetam Perperam Relato. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1889. The author endeavours to show that the inscription at Aquinum, which the majority of scholars have supposed to refer to the poet Juvenal, must refer to some one else of the same name. The argument is that the inscription, with its catalogue of military and municipal posts held by the writer, could only have been put up by a man of wealth and position. But if anything may be certainly inferred from the *Satires* of Juvenal with regard to their author's social position, it is that he must have been a poor man, obliged to take up declamation for his profession, and soured by the failure of his efforts to rise. M. de Chaufepié supports his reasoning mainly on the evidence of other inscriptions similar to that of Aquinum, and makes out, we think, a very good case. If we might assume that the Juvenalis of the inscription was the father of the poet, the rich freedman of the biographies, many difficulties would disappear.

Emil Stephant, De Martiale Verborum Novatore. Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen, vol. iv. part 2. Breslau: Koebner, 1889.

A careful and valuable dissertation enumerating the words which Martial has apparently used either alone among Latin writers, or first among Latin writers, or first among Latin poets. The lists suggest that many of these words were probably con-

versational or slang expressions. The essay will be useful, not only to lexicographers, but to students of Martial's life and social position. H. N.

Rivista di Filologia. Edd. Comparetti, Müller and Flechia. Torino. 1889—90.

Fasc. 4—6 contain (1) Ch. Rossetti *Il drama satirico greco*, an essay without novelty. (2) E. Ferrero *Un Gentilizio Latino* etc. In *C.I.L.* V. 6766 the proposed reading *Kaninianus* is actually on the monument. A Turin inscription has the name P. *Lonticinus*, a hitherto unknown gentile description. (3) A Pais *Degli epicedii Latini*, an essay similar to (1). (4) C. Pascal *Quaestiones Vergilianae*, dealing with *Ecl.* IV. (5) L. Cerrato *Luoghi controversi nelle Pitiche Pindariche*, a large collection of notes, followed by a collation of the Ashburnham MS. now in Florence. (6) A. Mazzolini *Il 'trans pondera' di Oragio Epp. I. 6, 51*, following Dillenburger. (7) F. Ramorino *Il Cesare Riccardiano 541*, a collation of this MS. which is assigned to the beginning of the xiiith century.

Fasc. 7—9 contains (1) D. Passi *Aiace Telamonio*, the first part of a long article on the Ajax-myth. (2) L. Valmaggia *Il Virgilianismo nella letteratura romana*. (3) L. Valmaggia *Virgilio anomalo*, on the alleged insensibility of Vergil to love. (4) C. O. Zuretti *Scotii al Pluto ed alle Rane di Aristofane* from cod. Venetus 472, and cod. Cremonensis 12229 L, 6, 28.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

Aequa (dall') G. A. Sopra i Poemi Omerici. Studi. 8vo. 109 pp. Venezia, Visentini.

Arc (P. L. d'). Histoire de la Propriété prétorienne à Rome. 8vo. 103 pp. Paris, Rousseau.

Berger (E.). Stylistique latine. Traduite de l'allemand par F. Gache et S. Piquet, et remaniée par M. Bonnet. Nouvelle édition, corrigée et considérablement augmentée. 12mo. xxiii, 386 pp. Paris, Klincksieck.

Bieske (F.). Elementarbuch der lateinischen Sprache. Teil III. Quarta. De viris illustribus. Lateinisches Lesebuch nach Nepos, Livius, Curtius. Bearbeitet von H. Müller. 8vo. xi, 128 pp. Hannover, C. Meyer. 1 Mk. 60.

Birt (T.). De Catulli ad Mallium Epistula. 8vo. xx pp. Marburg, Elwert. 1 Mk.

Bladé (J. F.). Epigraphie antique de Gascogne. 8vo. xv, 225 pp. Bordeaux, Chollet. (1885).

Boetticher (E.). Hissarlik, wie es ist. Fünftes Sendschreiben über Schliemann's Troja. Auf Grund der Untersuchungen vom 1^{sten} bis 6^{ten} Dezember 1889 und im Frühjahr und Sommer 1890. 14 plans and illustrations. 8vo. iii, 115 pp. Berlin, Trautwein. 3 Mk.

Bruening (A.). De M. Juniani Justini codicibus. commentatio philologica. 8vo. 54 pp. Münster. 1 Mk. 20.

Buchner's Sammlung lateinischer Uebungsbücher. Teil 1—3. 8vo. Bamberg, Buchner's Verlag. Bound. 8 Mk. 50.

[Contents: I. Lateinisches Elementarbuch für

die 1^{ste} Klasse der Lateinschule von S. Lauzinger. viii, 181 pp. Bound. 2 Mk. 20.—II. Lateinisches Uebungsbuch für die 2^{te} Klasse der Lateinschule von S. Röckl. vii, 210 pp. Bound. 2 Mk. 10.—III. Lateinisches Uebungsbuch für die 3^{te} Klasse der Lateinschule von H. Hellmuth und F. Gerhard. viii, 319 pp. Bound. 3 Mk. 20.

Bugge (S.). Etruskisch und Armenisch. Sprachvergleichende Forschungen. Reihe I. 8vo. xviii, 171 pp. Christiania, Aschehoug & Co. 3 Mk.

Busch (H.). Lateinisches Uebungsbuch. Teil III. Für Quarta. 4^{te} verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von W. Fries. 8vo. viii, 148 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. Bound. 1 Mk. 80.

Busch und Fries. Lateinisches Uebungsbuch. Teil IV. Abteilung 1. 8vo. Berlin, Weidmann. Bound. 1 Mk. 80.

Contents: Lateinisches Uebungsbuch für Tertia im Anschluss an Caesar Bellum Gallicum nebst Phrasensammlung und Memorierstoff von W. Fries. Abteilung 1. Für Unter-Tertia. 2^{te} verbesserte Auflage. 8vo. viii, 80 pp.

Cabrol (E.). Voyage en Grèce, 1889. Notes et impressions. 4to. 163 pp. Plates and plans. Paris, Librairie des Bibliophiles.

Cicero. De Oratore. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von Dr. K. W. Fiderit. 6^{te} Auflage besorgt von O. Harnacker. Buch III. Mit den erklärenden Indices und einem Register zu den Anmerkungen. 8vo. 397—616 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 50.

— Plaidoyer pour Milon. Expliqué littérale-

- ment annoté et revu pour la traduction française par C. Sommer. 12mo. 200 pp. Paris, Hachette & Co. 1 fr. 50.
- Ciceronis* (M. Tullii.) Cato Major, seu de Senectute dialogus. Texte latin publié avec sommaires et notes en français par J. B. Lechatellier. 2^{ème} édition. 18mo. iv, 68 pp. Paris, Poussielgue.
- Cicero's* Rede de Imperio Cn. Pompei, nach pädagogischen Gesichtspunkten erklärt von F. Thümen. 8vo. viii, 140 pp. Berlin, Gaertner. 1 Mk. 40.
- Cornelio Nipote* Vite. Publicate per scuole da Andrea Weidner, e ridotte ad uso dei ginnasi italiani da Antonio Zernitz. Secondo la terza edizione tedesca. 12mo. xviii, 156 pp. Illustrations and map. Leipzig, Freytag. 1 Mk.
- Curtius* (G.) Griechische Schulgrammatik. 20^{te} Auflage bearbeitet von W. von Hartel. 8vo. xix, 157 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. 1 Mk.
- Demosthenis* Orationes Selectae. In usum scholarum edidit F. Slumeczek. Accedunt ex orationibus xviii et xix excerpta. Adjuncta est tabula. 16mo. xxi, 129 pp. Wien, Gerold's Sohn. Boards. 80 Pf.
- Demosthenes'* Rede für die Megalopoliten. Für den Schulgebrauch bearbeitet von W. Fox. A und B. 16mo. Freiburg, Herder. 50 Pf.
- Contents: A. Text. 10 pp. 10 Pf. B. Kommentar. 40 Pfg.
- Rede für die Megalopoliten. Griechisch und Deutsch, mit ausführlichem, kritischem und exegetischem Kommentar von W. Fox, S.J. 8vo. xii, 205 pp. Freiburg i/M, Herder. 4 Mk. 50.
- Dennis d'Halicarnasse*, Jugement sur Lysias. Texte et traduction française publiés avec un commentaire critique et explicatif par A. M. Desrousseaux. 8vo. xxiv, 23 pp. Paris, Hachette & Co. 2 fr. 50.
- Dietsch* (I.) Quaestiones Hyginianae. Dissertatio inauguralis. 8vo. 55 pp. Kiel. 1 Mk. 50.
- Dissertationes philologiae Vindobonenses. Vol. II. 8vo. iii, 302 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. 8 Mk.
- Duhn* (F.) und *Jacobi* (L.) Der griechische Tempel in Pompeii. Nebst einem Anhang: Ueber Schornsteinanlagen und eine Badeeinrichtung im Frauenbad der Stabianer Thermen in Pompeii. Plates. Folio. 37 pp. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 10 Mk.
- Elegiker, römische [Catull, Tibull, Propert, Ovid] in Auswahl für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von A. Biese. 12mo. xx, 65 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. 75 Pf.
- Escher* (J.) Triton und seine Bekämpfung durch Herakles. 8vo. vi, 139 pp. Leipzig, Fock. 2 Mk. 50.
- Festus*. De Verborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome. Edidit E. Aemilius Thewrewk de Ponor. Pars I. 8vo. viii, 631 pp. Buda-Pesth. 1889. 7 Mk. 50.
- Flierte* (J.) Ueber Nachahmungen des Demosthenes, Thucydides und Xenophon in den Reden der römischen Archaeologie des Dionysius von Halicarnass. 8vo. 85 pp. Leipzig, Fock. 1 Mk. 20.
- Florilegium Graecum in usum primi gymnasiarum ordinis collectum a philologis Afranjs. Fasciculi ix et x (finis). 12mo. 66, 84 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Boards. 45 Pf.
- Prohwein* (E.) Hauptregeln der griechischen Syntax. 4^{te} Auflage neu bearbeitet von A. Grumme und H. Rudert. 8vo. iv, 84 pp. Gera, Kanitz' Verlag. Bound. 1 Mk. 30.
- Gehrman* (B.) Demosthenis Thracis *μεταβολών* 'Οδοσσέας fragmenta. Dissertatio. 8vo. 44 pp. Königsberg. 1 Mk.
- Gomperz* (T.) Die Apologie der Heilkunst, eine griechische Sophistenrede des fünften vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts bearbeitet, übersetzt, erläutert und eingeleitet. [Extract Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaft.] 8vo. 196 pp. Wien, Tempsky. 3 Mk. 60.
- Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung griechischer Schriftsteller. IV. [Extract Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.] 8vo. 22 pp. Wien, Tempsky. 50 Pf.
- Gropius* (K.) Griechische Vorschule. 8vo. viii, 144 pp. Berlin, Winckelmann u. Söhne. 1 Mk. 60.
- Grumbach* (G.) and *Waltz* (A.) Prosodie et Métrique latines, suivies d'exercices. 9^e édition, revue et corrigée. 12mo. viii, 116 pp. Paris, Garnier frères.
- Günther* (P.) De ea, quae inter Timaeum et Lycophronem intercedit, ratione. 8vo. 74 pp. Leipzig. 1 Mk. 20.
- Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft in systematischer Darstellung. In Verbindung mit Dr. Autenrieth, A. Bauer, Blass, etc., herausgegeben von Iwan Müller. Band VII. 2^{te} verbesserte Auflage. 8vo. München, Beck. 13 Mk. 50.
- [Contents: Geschichte der griechischen Literatur bis auf die Zeit Justinians von W. Christ. xii, 769 pp. Illustrations.]
- Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft in systematischer Darstellung. In Verbindung mit Autenrieth, A. Bauer, Blass, etc., herausgegeben von Iwan Müller. 15. Halbband. 8vo. Band VIII. Abteilung I. xvi, 304 pp. München, Beck. 5 Mk. 50.
- [Contents: Band VIII. Römische Literaturgeschichte von M. Schanz. Teil 1. Die römische Literatur in der Zeit der Republik. xvii, 304 pp.]
- Hartel* (W.) Patristische Studien. II. und III. [Extract Sitzungsbericht der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.] 8vo. Wien, Tempsky. Each 1 Mk. 60f.
- [Contents: II. Zu Tertullian ad Nationes. 84 pp. III. Zu Tertullian ad Nationes de testimonio animae, scorpiace. 88 pp.]
- Hesselmeyer* (E.) Die Pelasgerfrage und ihre Lösbarkeit. 8vo. xiv, 162 pp. Tübingen, Fues. 3 Mk. 60.
- Hoffmann* (O. A.) Hermes und Kerykeion. Studie zur Urbedeutung des Hermes. Plate. 8vo. 52 pp. Marburg, Elwert. 1 Mk. 50.
- Holzweissig* (F.) Alphabetisch geordnetes Wörterverzeichnis zu dem Übungsbuch für den Unterricht im Lateinischen, Kursus der Sexta. 8vo. 44 pp. Hannover, Norddeutsche Verlagsanstalt. Boards. 60 Pf.
- Homer*. L'Iliade. Chant VI. Édition revue et annotée par C. Appert. 2^e édition. 18mo. 40 pp. Paris, Poussielgue.
- Iliade. Éditione abbreviata di A. T. Christ. Publicata per uso de ginnasi italiani da G. Defant. Illustrations and 2 maps. 12mo. xxxiv, 408 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. 2 Mk. 25.
- Ilias in verkürzter Ausgabe. Für den Schulgebrauch von A. T. Christ. Illustrations and Maps. 12mo. xxx, 407 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. 2 Mk. 25.
- Homeri*. Odysseae epitome. In usum scholarum edidit Fr. Stolz. 2 partes. 16mo. Wien, Gerold's Sohn. Boards. 1 Mk. 80.
- Hymnus Homericus in Mercurium ab A. Ludwig editus, adiectis animadversionibus criticis in Phlegontis Oracula Sibyllina. 4to. 52 pp. Königsberg i/Pr. W. Koch. 2 Mk.
- Ipfelkofer* (A.) Die Rhetorik des Anaximenes unter den Werken des Aristoteles. Inaugural-Dissertation. 8vo. 55 pp. Würzburg. 1889.
- Isokrates'* Panegyrikos. Für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von B. Keil. 12mo. xxv, 69 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. 75 Pf.

- Kaestner* (O.) De aeris, quae ab imperio Caesaris Octaviani Constitutio initium duxerint dissertatio. 8vo. 94 pp. Leipzig. 2 Mk.
- Klein* (J.) Die Mythologie des Sophokles in seinen Thebanischen Tragödien. 4to. 35 pp. Eberswalde. 1 Mk.
- Köhler* (A.) Ueber die Sprache der Briefe des P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther. (Cicero Epistolae ad Familiares XII. 14 and 15). 8vo. 43 pp. Nürnberg. 1 Mk.
- Kopecký* (L. F. I.) Die attischen Trieren. 8vo. ix, 154 pp. Illustrations. Leipzig, Veit & Co. 5 Mk. 60.
- Kröger* (K. W.) Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen. Teil 1: Ueber die gewöhnliche, vorzugsweise Attische Prosa. Heft 2: Syntax. Sechste verbesserte Auflage mit Nachweisung der gewählten Beispiele, besorgt von W. Pökel. 8vo. Weimar, Kröger. 4 Mk.
- Kunz* (F.) Die älteste römische Epik in ihrem Verhältnisse zu Homer. Nach den erhaltenen Fragmenten zusammengestellt. 8vo. 26 pp. Untermeiling. 1 Mk. 20.
- Lantoiné* (H.) Epitome historiae graecae. 32mo. 219 pp. Illustrations. Paris, Colin & Co.
- Larsen* (S. C.) Studia Critica in Plutarchi Moralia. 8vo. 152 pp. Kopenhagen, Hagerup. 1889. 3 Mk.
- Lattmann* (H.) Selbständiger und bezogener Gebrauch der Tempora im Lateinischen. 8vo. vi, 150 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 3 Mk. 60.
- Lederer* (S.) Ist Vergil der Verfasser von "Culex" und "Ciris"? Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Hexameters. Mit einer Tabelle als Beilage. 8vo. 16 pp. Leipzig, Fock. 1 Mk.
- Lepsius* (G. R.) Griechische Marmorstudien. [Extract: Abhandlungen der kaiserlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften]. 4to. 135 pp. Illustrations. Berlin, G. Reimer. 6 Mk. 50.
- Lesebuch*, griechisches, für die evangelische Missionsanstalt in Basel. Teil II. Aus Geschichte und Philosophie. 12mo. 174 pp. Basel, Missionsbuchhandlung. 1 Mk. 60.
- Levi* (S.) Quid de Graecis veterum Indorum monumenta tradiderint, thesım Facultati litterarum Parisiensı proponebat S. Levi. 8vo. 71 pp. Paris, Bouillon.
- Livy*. Editionem I. curavit G. Weissenborn. Editio II. quam curavit M. Müller. Pars IV. fasciculus 2. Libri xxxvi-xxxviii. 12mo. xv, 243-415 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Each 60 Pf.
- Edidit A. Zingerle. Pars II. Liber VI-X. Editio minor. 12mo. 245 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. 1 Mk.
- Edidit A. Zingerle. Pars II. Liber VI-X. Editio major. 12mo. vii, 245 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. 1 Mk. 20.
- Luchs* (A.) Emendationum Livianarum particula IV. 4to. 15 pp. Erlangen. 80 Pf.
- Maass* (E.) De Aeschylı Supplicibus Commentatio. 4to. 38 pp. Greifswald. 1 Mk. 50.
- Meltzer* (J.) Einige grundsätzliche Bemerkungen über die Aussprache des Altgriechischen. [Extract: Korrespondenz-Blatt für die Gel.- und Realschulen]. 8vo. 10 pp. Tübingen, Fues. 30 Pf.
- Merchant* (F. I.) De Ciceronis partitionibus oratoriis commentatio. Dissertatio. 8vo. 87 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk. 50.
- Meusel* (H.) Lexicon Caesarianum. Fasciculi xiv. et xv. 8vo. (Band II. columns 977-1344). Berlin, W. Weber's Verlag. Each 2 Mk. 40.
- Müller* (A.) Vorlagen zum Uebersetzen ins Lateinische für Abiturienten bayerischer Gymnasien. 12mo. 43 pp. Würzburg, Stahel. 60 Pf.
- Minucius* (Felix.) Oktavius. Aus dem Lateinischen von H. Hagen. [Extract Alpenrosen]. 12mo. 89 pp. Bern, Haller. 1 Mk. 20.
- Mittheilungen, archaeologisch-epigraphische, aus Oesterreich-Ungarn, herausgegeben von O. Bendorff und E. Bonmann. Jahrgang XIII. Heft 2. 8vo. 129-211 pp. Plates. Wien, Tempsky. 5 Mk.
- Mittheilungen des kaiserlich deutschen archaeologischen Instituts, römische Abteilung. Band V. 4 Hefte. 8vo. Rom, Loescher & Co. 12 Mk.
- Moerner* (F.) De P. Papinii Statii Thebaide quaestiones criticae, grammaticae, metricae. Dissertatio. 8vo. 78 pp. Königsberg. 1 Mk. 20.
- Meschopoli* in Batrachomyomachiam commentarii. Pars I. edidit A. Ludwich. 4to. 7 pp. Königsberg. W. Koch. 60 Pf.
- Müller* (I.) Ueber die Pflege der Wissenschaft bei den Römern. 12mo. 23 pp. Innsbruck, Wagner. 80 Pf.
- Müller* (Lucian). De Horatii epistularum II. 1, 50-62 disputatio. [Extract: Acta Minist. publ. ross.] 8vo. 16 pp. Berlin, Calvary & Co. 1 Mk. 20.
- Müller* (Walther). Quaestiones vestiariae. 8vo. vi, 53 pp. Göttingen, Dieterich's Sortiment. 1 Mk.
- Murr* (J.) Die Pflanzenwelt in der griechischen Mythologie. 8vo. viii, 324 pp. Innsbruck, Wagner. 6 Mk.
- Oehler* (R.) Bilder-Atlas zu Caesar's Büchern de bello Gallico. Illustrations and maps. 4to. iv, 78 pp. Plates. Leipzig, Schmidt und Günther. 2 Mk. 85.
- Oehler* (W.), *Schubert* (G.), und *Sturmhoefel* (K.) Uebungsbuch für den grammatischen Unterricht im Lateinischen. Teil II. für Quinta, mit einem Wörterverzeichnis. 8vo. iv, 231 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 80.
- Otto* (A.) Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer. Gesammelt und erklärt. 8vo. xlv, 436 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 10 Mk.
- Ovid*. La Prima Elegia. Traduzione e note di L. Goretti. 8vo. 34 pp. Treviso, Tipografia ditta Longo.
- Le Metamorfosi recate in altrettanti versi italiani da G. Solari. 16mo. 294 pp. Milano, Guigoni. 1 lira.
- Pelligrini* (G. B.) Versioni da Ovidio, Catullo, Orazio, Minnermo. 16mo. 104 pp. Morta, A. Cortellezzi.
- Pellisson* (M.) Cicéron. 8vo. 240 pp. Paris, Lecène et Oudin.
- Persius*. Satires. Nouvellement traduites et annotées par L. Thézard. 18mo. 183 pp. Paris, Delagrave.
- Phaedri Fabularum libri quinque*. Texte latin publié avec une Notice sur Phédre, des Notes en Français et les Imitations de La Fontaine et de Florian par E. Talbert. 16mo. iv, 140 pp. Paris, Hachette & Co. 80 centimes.
- Planude*. Epistulae edidit M. Treu. 8vo. ix, 275 pp. Breslau, Koebner. 6 Mk.
- Plato*. L'Eutifrone. Edizione scholastica di A. T. Christ. Adattata ai ginnasi italiani da C. Christofolini. 12mo. xvi, 36 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. 40 Pf.
- Euthyphron. Für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von A. T. Christ. 12mo. xvi, 35 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. 40 Pf.
- Gorgias. Für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von A. T. Christ. 12mo. xxiv, 163 pp. 1 Mk.
- Plautus*. Comoediae. Recensuit, instrumento critico et prolegomenis auxit F. Ritscheli, sociis operae

- adsumptis G. Loewe, G. Goetz, F. Schoell. Tomi IV. fasciculus 1. 8vo. Leipzig, Teubner. 5 Mk. 60.
[Contents: Casina recensuit F. Schoell. xl, 172 pp.]
- Il militare fanfarone. Versione metrica di S. Cognetti de Martiis. 8vo. vi, 76 pp. Torino, E. Loecher. 1 lira.
- Plutarchus*. Vie de Démosthène. Texte grec, avec des notes grammaticales, historiques et littéraires par A. Julien. 3^{ème} édition. 18mo. viii, 58 pp. Paris, Poussielgue.
- Pollio* (C. Asinius). Bericht über die spanischen Unruhen des Jahres 48 vor Christus. [Bellum Alexandrinum 48–64] auf Grund des Codex Ashburnhamensis neu herausgegeben von G. Landgraf. 8vo. 32 pp. Leipzig, Deichert. 1 Mk.
- Porphyri quaestionum homeriarum ad Odysseam pertinentium reliquias collegit, disposuit, edidit H. Schrader. 8vo. x, 217 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 10 Mk.
- Präparationen nebst Uebersetzung zu Xenophon's Anabasis. Von einem Schulmann. Buch I. 18mo. 148 pp. Düsseldorf, Schwann. 50 Pf.
- Pulvermacher* (N.) De Georgicis a Vergilio retractatis. 8vo. 118 pp. Berlin, Heinrich und Kemcke. 2 Mk.
- Quintilian* (M. F.) De Institutione Oratoria. Liber primus. Texte latin, publié avec des notes biographiques sur Quintilien, l'histoire de l'Institution oratoire et de ses abrégés, la classification, et la description des manuscrits, le texte abrégé par E. de Rouen et par J. Racine, des notes critiques, les variantes principales et 2 facsimilés de manuscrits par C. Fierville. 8vo. clxxv, 177 pp. Paris, Didot et C^{ie}.
- Reinach* (T.) De Archia Poeta. (Thèse). 8vo. 77 pp. Paris, Leroux.
- Rhoen* (C.) Die römischen Thermen zu Aachen. Eine archäologisch-topographische Darstellung. 12mo. 70 pp. Plate. Aachen, Cremer. 1 Mk. 20.
- Sallustius*. Conjuration de Catilina. Guerre de Jugurtha. Discours et lettres tirés des histoires de Salluste. 2^e édition revue et corrigé avec des notes et un index explicatif des noms propres (suivie de la lettre et du discours à César sur l'organisation de la République par M. L. Constans. 12mo. xviii, 337 pp. Paris, Delagrave.
- Schmidt* (A. M. A.) Ueber das Homerische in Sophokles Aias [in sachlicher Hinsicht]. 8vo. 52 pp. Waidhofen. 1 Mk. 80.
- Schmidt* (I.) Commentar zu den Lebensbeschreibungen des Cornelius Nepos. Für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben. 12mo. vi, 110 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. 90 Pf.
- Schneiderwin* (M.) Die horazische Lebensweisheit aus den 15 den Fragen der Lebenskunst gewidmeter Oden entwickelt und beurteilt. 8vo. iv, 40 pp. Hannover, Hahn. Boards. 1 Mk.
- Schöll* (R.) Die Anfänge einer politischen Literatur bei den Griechen. 4to. 37 pp. München, Franz. 1 Mk.
- Schubert* (R.) Herodots Darstellung der Cyrus-Sage. 8vo. iii, 85 pp. Breslau, Koenner. 2 Mk. 40.
- Skutsch* (F.) De nominibus latinis suffixi -no -ope formati observationes variae. Commentatio. 8vo. 34 pp. Breslau, Koenner. 1 Mk.
- Sobolewski* (Sergius). De praepositionum usu Aristophaneo. 8vo. vi 229 pp. Moskau, Lang. 4 Mk.
- Sophocles*. Antigone, tragédie. Traduction de J. I. Rouff et L. Aubert. 4to. 19 pp. Auteuil, Imprimerie Roussel.
- Oedipe à Colone. Expliqué littéralement et annoté en français par M. Sommer. Traduit en français par M. Bellaguet. 12mo. 247 pp. Paris, Hachette & Co. 2 fr.
- Spanoghe* (E.) Emendationes Tullianae. Miscella. 8vo. vii, 67 pp. Leiden, Brill. 1 Mk. 70.
- Sprengel* (J. G.) De ratione quae in historia plantarum inter Plinium et Theophrastum intercedit. Dissertatio inauguralis. 8vo. 63 pp. Marburg. 1 Mk. 50.
- Steiner* (J. and A. Scheindler). Lateinisches Lese- und Übungsbuch für die 2^e Classe der österreichischen Gymnasien. Im Anschluss an die lateinische Grammatik von A. Scheindler herausgegeben. Mit einem Wortkunde. 8vo. vi, 122 pp. und Wortkunde 128 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. Bound. 2 Mk. 50.
- Steinthal* (H.) Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen und Römern mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Logik. Zweite vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage. Teil I. 8vo. xvi, 374 pp. Berlin, Dümmler's Verlag. 8 Mk.
- Strack* (H.) Baudenkmäler des alten Rom, nach photographischen Original-Aufnahmen herausgegeben. Folio. 20 plates. vii, 19 pp. Berlin, Wasmuth. 20 Mk.
- Studien, Berliner, für classische Philologie und Archaeologie. Band xi. Heft 1 und 2. 8vo. Berlin, Calvary & Co. Each 1 Mk. 50.
[Contents: I. Dingeldein (O.) Haben die Theatermasken der Alten die Stimme verstärkt? 46 pp. II. Maximiani elegiae. Ad fidem codicis Etonensis recensuit et emendavit M. Petschening. 40 pp.]
- Salpicii Severi liber de vita sancti Martini, cum epistulis et dialogis*. Édition classique, avec notice, arguments, et notes en français par F. Dübner revue d'après l'édition Halm de 1866. 18mo. viii, 115 pp. Paris, Lecoffre.
- Terentius*. Les Adelphes, Comédie. Traduite en français par A. Marnet. Avec le texte latin. 12mo. 99 pp. Paris, Hachette & Co. 1 fr. 50.
- Virgil*. Opera. Texte latin, publié d'après les travaux les plus récents de la philologie avec un commentaire critique et explicatif, une introduction, et une notice par E. Benoist. Aeneis libri vii–xii. 8vo. lii, 457 pp. Paris, Hachette & Co. 7 fr. 50.
- Vollmann* (F.) Ueber das Verhältnis der späteren Stoa zur Sklaverei im römischen Reiche. 8vo. 98 pp. Stadthof. 75 Pf.
- Weisweiler* (I.) Das lateinische participium futuri passivi in seiner Bedeutung und syntaktischen Verwendung. Grammatische Studie. 8vo. vii, 146 pp. Paderborn, F. Schöningh. 2 Mk. 80.
- Xenophon's* Kypopädie. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von L. Breitenbach. Heft 1. 4^{te} Auflage besorgt von Büchsenhützel. 8vo. iii, 175 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 50.
- Zander* (C.) Versus italici antiqui. Collegit, recensuit, rationem metricam explicavit C. Z. 8vo. vii, cccxii, 124 pp. Lund, Möller. 5 Mk.
- Zuretti* (C. O.) Qui in antiquitate Euripidem poetae sint imitati. 8vo. 51 pp. Torino, V. Bona.